Paper: **"Diseño de un Modelo de Regresión Lineal Múltiple Para Predecir el Rendimiento de Estudiantes de Institutos Superiores Tecnológicos Públicos Frente a la Nueva Normalidad"**

Corresponding Author: Evelin Edda Pinargote Junco

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amaya Epelde Larranaga
University of Granada, Spain

Reviewer 2: David Perez Jorge
University of La Laguna, Spain

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: Amaya Epelde Larrañaga	
University/Country: University of Granada - Spain	
Date Manuscript Received: 17/12/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/12/2020
Manuscript Title: Diseño de un modelo de regresión lineal múltiple para predecir el rendimiento de estudiantes de institutos superiores tecnológicos públicos frente a la nueva normalidad	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1291/20	
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**
The title is clear and adequate to the content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
In the abstract it is necessary to add the most important results and conclusions	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
There are many grammatical errors, expression errors, accents, concordance, punctuation marks throughout the document. It is necessary to correct them. In some paragraphs it is even necessary to rewrite the paragraphs. *It is also necessary to reorganize the entire theoretical framework, especially the first 12 pages. There are concepts that overlap. A conceptual organization is needed to improve the quality of the document.* *See the comments in the document.*	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The methodology is well explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
The results are correct.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
In the conclusions it is necessary to make a comparison with the research of other authors on the same topic.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
The references are correct, but there are references that are not cited in the text and there are other references where the title is capitalized, and it should not be. *See the document where these errors have been indicated.*	

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):

It is necessary:
1. Read the entire document and correct all grammatical and expression errors, and rewrite the paragraphs that need it.
2. To add in the Abstract the most important results and conclusions.
3. To make in the Conclusions, a comparison with the research of other authors.
4. To correct the references.

See the attached document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It can be published, after making the indicated corrections.