Manuscript: "**La Responsabilidad Social Centrada En La Accesibilidad Web**"

Reviewer 1: Luis Enrique Colmenares-Guillén,
Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico

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: Luis Enrique Colmenares-Guillén	Email:
University/Country: Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: LA RESPONSABILIDAD SOCIAL CENTRADA EN LA ACCESIBILIDAD WEB	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 42.09.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough 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.	**5**
Is clear and adequate to the content of the article. **Es claro y adecuado el contenido del articulo**	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**

The abstract is clear and presents objects, methods and results. **El resumen esta claro y presenta los tres elementos**	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
Pocos errores que ya fueron señalados en el document. Few errors that were already indicated in this article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
Muy bien, very good	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
En la metodologia menciona que utiliza 11 producciones digitales (Artefactos software funcionales) y en sus evaluaciones (en las figuras) lo identifica como sitios. Los sitios son los artefactos software funcionales eso lo tiene que mencionar para darle consistencia al articulo	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
Is very good	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
Good	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

En las palabras claves o Keywords, Estas no lo son. métodos y herramientas y formación profesional
Muy buen trabajo.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: