Manuscript: **"Las Competencias Docentes A Nivel Tecnológicas Como Sostenibilidad Del Aprendizaje En Entornos Virtuales De Aprendizaje"**

Corresponding Author: Marilyn Antonieta Briones Lucio

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: John Tobar Litardo, Ecuador

Reviewer 2: Oruam Cadex Marichal Guevara, Universidad de Ciego de Ávila Máximo Gómez Báez

Reviewer 3: Marcelo Eduardo Allauca Peñafiel, Escuela Superior Politécnica de Chimborazo / Ecuador

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

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: John Tobar Litardo	
University/Country: Ecuador	
Date Manuscript Received:9/4/2012	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/4/2012
Manuscript Title: **LAS COMPETENCIAS DOCENTES A NIVEL TECNOLÓGICAS COMO SOSTENIBILIDD DEL APRENDIZAJE EN ENTORNOS VIRTUALES DE APRENDIZAJE**	
ESJ Manuscript Number**: 0449/21**	
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**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**

(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) **Revisar la redacción, existe contenido no redactado en tercera persona y también siglas que se repiten varias veces en el mismo párrafo.**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	

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):

Estimados autores, su trabajo muestra resultados e información de interés. Sin embargo, existen varias observaciones y ajustes relacionados con la redacción, por favor revisar los comentarios en el documento.

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

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: Oruam Cadex Marichal Guevara	
University/Country: Universidad de Ciego de Ávila Máximo Gómez Báez	
Date Manuscript Received: 9/4/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/4/21
Manuscript Title: **LAS COMPETENCIAS DOCENTES A NIVEL TECNOLÓGICAS COMO SOSTENIBILIDD DEL APRENDIZAJE EN ENTORNOS VIRTUALES DE APRENDIZAJE**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 49.04.2021	
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 adequate	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	**3**

results.	
The objective of the research is not clearly presented	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
no grammatical and spelling errors are apparent	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
The type of research and the methodology used in the research process are not sufficiently explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
There are no errors in the results	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
The conclusions are accurate, but the abstract is not, because it does not clearly express the objective of the research as well as the methods used.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
The references are consistent, therefore the references and citations coincide	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 9/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/04/2021
Manuscript Title: LAS COMPETENCIAS DOCENTES A NIVEL TECNOLÓGICAS COMO SOSTENIBILIDD DEL APRENDIZAJE EN ENTORNOS VIRTUALES DE APRENDIZAJE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 49-04-2021	
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: 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.	**2**
El título no es claro y no es acorde al desarrollo del contenido del artículo. Debe ser reformulado	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**2**
El resumen no tiene lectura horizontal, carece de sus objetivos metodología y los resultados indicados no ha sido incluidos.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
Tiene pocas faltas ortográficas; sin embargo, el contenido no se ajusta al contexto de la investigación.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**2**
No se explica el diseño de la investigación *No se determina de manera clara la población y la muestra* *No se determina la si la encuesta fue validada* *Se menciona q se hace encuestas a docentes y estudiantes, pero solo constan la de los docentes*	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**2**
Los resultados solo se centran en la interpretación de las preguntas de las encuestas, donde no se hacen de manera adecuada las interpretaciones. *En el resumen se menciona la creación de una herramienta, sin embargo, no constan en los resultados* *Adjunta un anexo que debe estar referenciado*	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2**
Las conclusiones no representan el contexto de la investigación	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
Algunas referencias no estan citadas adecuadamente.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)：

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Adjunto al formulario se encuentra el archivo de word, donde están comentados las observaciones del mismo.