ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper.
You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 2018, 6 February	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 15 February
Manuscript Title: ESTUDIO SOBRE LA RELACIÓN ENTRE *MOBBING* Y LA SATISFACCIÓN LABORAL EN DOCENTES DE INSTITUCIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR EN MÉXICO	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 01123/18	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(a brief explanation is recommendable) Adecuado. Adequate.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(An explanation is recommendable) *Se indican objetivos, método y resultados de forma clara.* Objectives, method and results are clearly indicated	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(a brief explanation is recommendable) En apartado de resultados, aparece una errata en la palabra hipótesis (cada hip{otesis) In the results section, an erratum appears in the word hypothesis (each hip {otesis)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(An explanation is recommendable)	

Cambiar título del apartado metodología por Método Change title of the methodology section by Method	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
(An explanation is recommendable) sugerencia en apartado marco conceptual, indicar como titulo los temas que se desarrollan, por ejemplo: mobbing y satisfaccion laboral suggestion in the conceptual framework, indicate as title the topics that are developed, for example: mobbing and job satisfaction	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(An explanation is recommendable) añadir discusión en apartado de conclusions add discussion in the conclusions section	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. *(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)*	**5**
(a brief explanation is recommendable) *Acordes* *chords*	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	**x**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Mínimos cambios: En apartado de resultados, aparece una errata en la palabra hipótesis (cada hip{otesis). Se sugiere en apartado marco conceptual, indicar como titulo los temas que se desarrollan, por ejemplo: mobbing y satisfaccion laboral. Tambiém cambiar título del apartado metodología por Método y añadir discusión en apartado de conclusions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: Accepted, minor revisions needed.