

Manuscript: “**Identificación De Liderazgo Académico Para El Emprendimiento De Enfermería En La Región De Orizaba, Veracruz, México**”

Submitted: 18 August 2020

Accepted: 25 January 2020

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Dr. Abril Camarillo Quiroz

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p284

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luis Arriola Diaz,
College Interdisciplinary de Specialization México

Reviewer 2: Rebeca Guzman Saldaña,
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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 Arriola Díaz	
University/Country: College Interdisciplinary de specialization México	
Date Manuscript Received:01/sept/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/sept/2020
Manuscript Title: Academic leadership in nursing entrepreneurship.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN 1857-7881(print)	e ISSN 1857-7431
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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
(because it does a research study where the need to seek entrepreneurship in the nursing profession is manifested <i>Please insert your comments</i>)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
(The research study meets the objectives, methods and finally with the results <i>Please insert your comments</i>)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Only found one word that lacks the accent. Everything else is fine(<i>Please insert your comments</i>)	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
It is perfectly understood what was their study method and how they carried it out as well as the results they obtained and the recommendations they propose. <i>lease insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
The body of research is clear, without errors, anyone can understand it perfectly.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are supported by their research and by the background shown in the study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
References are complete and appropriate and are displayed by various authors throughout their research study.	

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):

A big congratulations for your effort, throughout my profession I have reviewed many articles and reviews and this is very clear, very understandable and applicable language.

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: Rebeca Guzmán-Saldaña	Email:
University/Country: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Liderazgo académico en el emprendimiento de enfermería.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>El título es congruente con lo abordado en el artículo</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>El abstract puede precisar los resultados del estudio agregando datos cuantitativos</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Revisar acentos en todo el documento y agregar palabras que vinculen a un párrafo con otro.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Si se explica el método, falta que precisen los indicadores que utilizaron en el apartado de búsqueda en base de datos.</i>	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2	
<p><i>En el apartado del Marco Teórico no queda claro el por qué se establece una introducción asociada con la pandemia por COVID 19 y el objetivo del documento, por lo tanto se puede prescindir de esto.</i></p> <p><i>Particularmente en el apartado de Resultados falta que los autores describan los datos, ya que solo se agregaron las gráficas. Así mismo, se sugiere realizar análisis estadísticos más elaborados</i></p>		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3	
<p><i>La discusión y conclusiones debe iniciar señalando si se cumplieron sus objetivos de estudio y partir de estos para guiar la discusión.</i></p> <p><i>Ahondar en la discusión de los resultados, y en conclusiones agregar limitaciones del estudio, y sugerencias para futuras investigaciones.</i></p>		
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4	
<p><i>Hay varios errores en cuanto a seguir el format APA, por lo que se sugiere revisar tanto las citas como las referencias.</i></p>		

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Realizar los ajustes de acuerdo con los comentarios en cada apartado.

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:	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/11/2020
Manuscript Title: Identificación de liderazgo académico para el emprendimiento de enfermería en México.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---94.08.2020---corrected paper after major report--	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<p><i>Es necesario revisar:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Homogeneidad de tamaños de fuentes.</i> 2. <i>Diferentes tipos de interlineado a lo largo del documento.</i> 3. <i>Errores de "tipeo", esencialmente lo referido a las tildes.</i> <p>It is necessary to review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Homogeneity of font sizes. 2. Different types of line spacing throughout the document. 3. "Typing" errors, essentially referring to accents. 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p><i>Revisar la presentación de resultados. Ajustar.</i></p> <p>Review the presentation of results. Adjust.</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<p><i>En el apartado metodología, en el espacio "Resultados", debe resolverse la presentación de las figuras acorde a las normas APA, siendo éstas numeradas de modo correlativo, con un epígrafe acorde al contenido representado.</i></p> <p><i>El texto de este apartado debería reunir el análisis de la totalidad de los ítems evaluados y que han sido considerados significativos por los autores.</i></p> <p>In the methodology section, in the "Results" space, the presentation of the figures must be resolved in accordance with the APA standards, these being numbered in a correlative way, with a heading according to the content represented.</p> <p>The text of this section should include the analysis of all the items evaluated and that have been considered significant by the authors.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<p><i>La conclusión no es adecuada, ya que reitera datos expuestos en Resultados. Debe ser mejorada, pues la conclusión debe arribar, cualitativamente, a una "decision" final sobre la investigación realizada.</i></p> <p>The conclusion is not adequate, since it repeats data presented in Results. It must be improved, since the conclusion must qualitatively arrive at a final "decision" on the research carried out.</p>	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Las referencias bibliográficas deben ir de acuerdo a las normas APA, cuestión indicada en la revisión anterior y no considerada en el ajuste del documento.</i>	
The bibliographic references must be in accordance with the APA standards, a matter indicated in the previous review and not considered in the adjustment of the document.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Estimados autores,

Es notorio el trabajo realizado en post de la mejora del document. Pero, aún hay punto a revisar, esencialmente en el apartado “Resultados” y en “Conclusiones”. Los detalles, para ambos casos están indicados en el espacio respectivo.

Indico revisión mayor y re-submission, porque son dos puntos vertebradores del trabajo los que deben ser ajustados.

NO DESCUIDEN, por favor la corrección de los vocablos en cuanto a sus tildes.

Muchos han sido indicados en el sitio, otros no, deben ustedes localizarlos.

Revisen interlineados y ajusten según indicaciones del Journal. Homogeneizar este criterio. Igual tamaño de las fuentes.

Revisen y ajusten las referencias Bibliográficas según NORMAS APA.

RE-envíen documento para nueva revisión SIN LOS COMENTARIOS y habiendo aceptado las “correcciones” indicadas mediante del “control de Cambios” (del Revisar, en programa Word)

Dear authors,

The work done on improving the document is notorious. But, there is still a point to review, essentially in the "Results" and "Conclusions" section. The details for both cases are indicated in the respective space.

I indicate major review and re-submission, because there are two backbones of the work that must be adjusted.

DO NOT NEGLECT, please correct the words in terms of their accents. Many have been indicated on the site, others have not, you must locate them.

Check line spacing and adjust as directed by the Journal. Homogenize this criterion. Equal size of fonts.

Review and adjust bibliographic references according to APA STANDARDS.

RE-send document for new review WITHOUT COMMENTS and having accepted the “corrections” indicated through the “Change control” (from Review, in Word program)