

**Paper: “Aprendizaje Sincrónico y Asincrónico del Año 2020: el Caso del Instituto Tecnológico de Saltillo, Coahuila”**

**Submitted: 15 December 2021**

**Accepted: 08 February 2022**

**Published: 28 February 2022**

Corresponding Author: Edith Reyes

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n6p22](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n6p22)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Gladys Aidé García López  
Universidad Autónoma de Coahuila. México

Reviewer 4: Sofia Mitre Camacho  
Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala, Mexico

# 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: Gladys Aidé García López	
University/Country: Universidad Autónoma de Coahuila. México	
Date Manuscript Received: 29/12/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/01/2022
Manuscript Title: Aprendizaje sincrónico y asincrónico: El caso del Instituto Tecnológico de Saltillo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1288/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Si acepto	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Si lo apruebo	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Si lo apruebo	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>El título es completamente claro y adecuado</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>En el resumen se presentan claramente los objetivos, metodología y resultados</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>No encontré ningún error gramatical o de ortografía en este artículo</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Los métodos de estudio son explicados con claridad</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Los resultados son claros y sin errores</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Las conclusiones y el resumen tienen suficiente respaldo y contenido que lo avale</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Referencias apropiadas y completas</b>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***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: 28/12/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/01/2022
Manuscript Title: <b>Aprendizaje sincrónico y asincrónico: el caso del Instituto Tecnológico de Saltillo, Coahuila</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 88.12.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Es algo adecuado, atendiendo al pretendido desarrollo del artículo.</i>	
It is something suitable, according to the intended development of the article	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><i>No es claro desde la redacción. Esto es, desde lo lingüístico y desde lo científico. No se advierte claramente la metodología, ni los resultados conclusivos del trabajo.</i></p> <p>It is not clear from the writing. That is, from the linguistic and from the scientific. The methodology and the conclusive results of the work are not clearly seen.</p>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><i>Revisar las estructuras gramaticales, pues no siempre, los párrafos donan claridad de ideas o planteamientos. Hay errores gramaticales, uso de palabras a repetición lo que lleva a generar un texto denso, poco claro. Tanto como las citas de autores. Los comentarios en el cuerpo del trabajo indican en cada punto estas observaciones.</i></p> <p>Review the grammatical structures, as paragraphs do not always provide clarity of ideas or approaches. There are grammatical errors, use of words to repetition which leads to generating a dense, unclear text.</p> <p>As well as quotes from authors. The comments in the body of the work indicate these observations at each point.</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><i>No, no es claro la metodología de estudio aplicada, tanto como los baremos extraídos y referenciados para resolver el análisis y discusión que guía hacia la conclusión.</i></p> <p>No, the applied study methodology is not clear, as well as the scales extracted and referenced to resolve the analysis and discussion that leads to the conclusion.</p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><i>En los resultados, los autores no son claros y siguen apelando a referenciales argumentales, sin construir criterios contundentes que permiten comparar adecuadamente las metodologías de interacción en la enseñanza-aprendizaje (sincrónico/presencial; versus asincrónico/a distancia), propuesto en la investigación.</i></p> <p>In the results, the authors are not clear and continue to appeal to argumentative references, without constructing conclusive criteria that allow an adequate comparison of the interaction methodologies in teaching-learning (synchronous / face-to-face; versus asynchronous / distance), proposed in the research</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>1</b>

*No son claras, ni contundentes. No aportan señales argumentativas que favorezcan a la riqueza del trabajo realizado.*

They are not clear and forceful. They do not provide argumentative signals that favor the richness of the work done.

**7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.**

*Hay numerosos autores referenciados que no están citados en el cuerpo del trabajo.  
A su vez, hay numerosos autores citados en el cuerpo del trabajo y no indicados en las referencias bibliográficas.  
Las referencias bibliográficas no respetan las normas APA.*

There are numerous referenced authors who are not cited in the body of the work. In turn, there are numerous authors cited in the body of the work and not indicated in the bibliographic references. Bibliographic references do not respect APA standards.

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	<b>X</b>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

*Estimados autores, vuestro trabajo carece de rigor científico.  
Aun, cuando la idea de avanzar en la comparativa es adecuada, la metodología, el estado del arte y las conclusiones son realmente débiles.  
Es una producción que deja muchos huecos sin llenar. Una producción donde aparece una enunciación de diversos autores, tal como si hubieran acudido a diferentes fuentes y en un acto de “copiar y pegar”, pretendieran dar coherencia argumental al trabajo de investigación.  
En vuestra producción apuntan, por ejemplo, a la educación por competencias desde el informe Delors a Alfa Tuning, sin llegar a resolver enlaces enriquecedores, de avance en torno a lo que proponen como trabajo novedoso de investigación. Quedan como citas, sin anclaje.  
Hay pobreza en la descripción del método de investigación propuesto, en las explicaciones que ayuden a entender la gráfica o figura propuesta “para el arreglo situacional de las variables”; en el concepto de “factores” expresado en la misma gráfica; en el análisis de las “matrices de componentes”.  
Hay debilidad absoluta en las conclusiones. Dejan sin claridad, las ventajas, o no, de ambos sistemas educativos propuestos para la investigación.  
Hay intensos errores en las citas bibliográficas.  
Todo está comentado en el cuerpo del trabajo.  
No es una publicación a corregir, es una publicación a REHACER de modo completo.*

*Esto significa, que vuestro estudio puede ser de gran interés. Pero, vuestro escrito es inadecuado totalmente.  
Saludos cordiales.*

Dear authors, your work lacks scientific rigor.

Even when the idea of advancing in the comparison is adequate, the methodology, the state of the art and the conclusions are really weak.

It is a production that leaves many gaps unfilled. A production where an enunciation of various authors appears, as if they had gone to different sources and in an act of "copying and pasting", they tried to give argumentative coherence to the research work.

In your production, for example, they point to education by competences from the Delors report to Alfa Tuning, without resolving enriching links, advancement around what they propose as novel research work. They remain as quotes, without anchoring.

There is poverty in the description of the proposed research method, in the explanations that help to understand the graph or figure proposed "for the situational arrangement of the variables"; in the concept of "factors" expressed in the same graph; in the analysis of the "component of matrix".

There is absolute weakness in the conclusions. They leave unclear the advantages, or not, of both educational systems proposed for research.

There are intense errors in the bibliographic citations.

Everything is commented in the body of the work.

It is not a publication to be corrected, it is a publication to be completely redone.

This means that your study can be of great interest. But, your writing is totally inappropriate.

Kind regards.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Estimado Editor:

Este trabajo es altamente deficiente. Sugiero su rechazo. Usted podrá ver cada ítem como ha sido evaluado.

Saludos cordiales.

Dear Editor:

This work is highly deficient. I suggest their rejection. You will be able to see each item as it has been evaluated.

Kind regards.