

Paper: “Propuesta de una Metodología de Desarrollo Proyectual en el Ámbito de la Responsabilidad Social para la Enseñanza en Arquitectura”

Submitted: 01 August 2022

Accepted: 08 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Diego Antonio Rios Gutierrez

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n25p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n25p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Marisa Cecilia Tumino
Adventista del Plata University, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Oruam Cadex Marichal Guevara
University Maximo Gomes Baez, Cuba

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

si

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

si

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

existen algunos errores por lo que sería recomendable que se haga una revisión general

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Si. Sin embargo deberían revisar la definición de las unidades de análisis y sujetos.

Recomiendo la lectura del tema como por ejemplo en "PRECISIONES METODOLÓGICAS SOBRE LA UNIDAD DE ANÁLISIS Y LA UNIDAD DE OBSERVACIÓN.

APLICACIÓN A LA INVESTIGACIÓN EN PSICOLOGIA" de Azcona, Maximiliano; Manzini, Fernando y Dorati, Javier.

No se describen los procedimientos seguidos para la construcción y validación de los instrumentos utilizados en el análisis cuantitativo.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Si. Sin embargo debe revisarse. Por ejemplo aparece la sigla CCI ¿Será CIC?

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Deberían aclarar detalladamente el procedimiento utilizado para la construcción y validación. Asimismo se necesita conocer la escala utilizada para su valoración. Solo se menciona que se utilizó el método Delphi.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Si

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and appropriate

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

A redundancy is expressed regarding the objective of the investigation

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

In the article there are some spelling errors such as:

The word "article, latest and practices" are not accented in some cases.

There are some errors of omission of letters that hinder the writing of the text.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The majority of methods are clearly explained, however, the criteria of experts are not clearly expressed in terms of the number of experts consulted, rounds developed from the Delp technique

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

the body of the article is clear, but contains some errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Conclusions are accurate and support the content

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Reference list is complete and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The expert method and the Delphi technique should be explained more
