



Paper: **“Metodología De Evaluación Del Desempeño De Métodos De Imputación Mediante Una Métrica Tradicional Complementada Con Un Nuevo Indicador”**

Corresponding Author: Carlos Roberto Primorac

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n18p61

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luisa Morales Maure, Universidad de Panamá, Panamá

Published: 30.06.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. 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 peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended 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!

Reviewer Name: Luisa Morales Maure	Email:
University/Country: Universidad de Panamá/ Panamá	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/04	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/ 04
Manuscript Title: Metodología de evaluación del desempeño de métodos de imputación mediante una métrica tradicional complementada con un nuevo indicador	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0503-20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>good title, clear and concise</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>perfect</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>improve some continuity errors between paragraphs</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>perfect</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>syntax errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>perfect</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>A correct use of citations, and the inclusion of references bibliographic</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Muy buen trabajo teorico.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: