

Paper: “Proceso Formativo de Docentes Universitarios para la Inclusión de Estudiantes con Discapacidad”

Submitted: 22 September 2020

Accepted: 02 November 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding Author: Ma. Concepción Connie

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p61

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Francisco Javier Mejía Ochoa
Tecnológico Nacional de México Campus Zongolica, Mexico

Reviewer 3: Jay Molino
Universidad Especializada de las Américas, Panamá

Reviewer 4: Ilya Casanova Romero
Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro de Manabí, Ecuador

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: Dr. Francisco Javier Mejía Ochoa	Email:
University/Country: Tecnológico Nacional de México Campus Zongolica	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/10/2020
Manuscript Title: Proceso formativo de docentes universitarios para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad Training process of university teachers for the inclusion of students with disabilities	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 32.10.2020	
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.

<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>El título es claro.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>El resumen es claro.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Importante revisar las observaciones al documento y hacer las modificaciones pertinentes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>El método de estudio está explicado claramente.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Importante revisar las observaciones al documento y hacer las modificaciones pertinentes.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Las conclusiones están de acuerdo al contenido del artículo.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Las referencias son las apropiadas con base en el artículo.</i>	

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):

Por favor, revisen las observaciones al documento y realicen las modificaciones pertinentes.

Buen trabajo, enhorabuena, mis más sinceras felicitaciones docentes e investigadores.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Jay Molino	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> 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.	4
Adecuado	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
Adecuado	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Los errores fueron marcados en el documento original en color rojo, amarillo y verde.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
Se aprecian fallas metodológicas, se hace necesario detallar mejor el proceso.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
No existe una articulación teórica, el contenido es redundante	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
No se mencionan las limitaciones, se redunda en lo abordado en el cuerpo del trabajo.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Se recomienda revisar las referencias para proveer fundamento a varios párrafos que necesitan referencias.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Existen retos grandes co el documento.

1. El documento es una descripción de un diplomado en la formación docente en temas de inclusión y discapacidad. El conocimiento que aporta a este campo no se visualiza.
2. El documento no posee una teoría sobre formación docente, ni inclusión, ni discapacidad.
3. Se emplea la palabra validación pero no se expande en este proceso.
4. En el documento se establecen Se trabajó con 10 docentes, sin embargo, solamente se hace referencia a 4. No se explica lo que sucedió con los otros seis.

Fortalezas:

- 1. Unidad de análisis.**
- 2. La selección de métodos del paradigma cualitativo.**

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: ILYA CASANOVA ROMERO	
University/Country: Ecuador	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Proceso formativo de docentes universitarios para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1032/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Some transcription errors, are pointed out in the article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>some minor details, can be easily corrected</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>some minor details, can be easily corrected</i>	

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):

Mejorar la calidad de la figura 1, se ve algo pixelada.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: