

Paper: “Actividad Física y Calidad de Vida en el Adulto Mayor”

Submitted: 08 November 2022

Accepted: 08 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Abigail Rojas

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ruth Magdalena Gallegos Torres

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Dra. en C.S. Ruth Magdalena Gallegos Torres	
University/Country: Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro	
Date Manuscript Received: 14 de noviembre	Date Review Report Submitted: 17 de noviembre
Manuscript Title: Actividad física y calidad de vida en el adulto mayor	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1172/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1

<i>No, it is necessary to adjust all of it.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>It is necessary to review redaction, completely. Many ideas are ambiguous; they have unfundament judgments. It is necessary to put order in their ideas.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Many information is missing. Details related with participants, sample, selection criteria, and more.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
<i>Results about descriptive variables are missing. It is necessary to put order and clarify their findings.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>Because it is important to reorganize introduction, methodology and results, I did not read discussion and conclusions.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>References are missing.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
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: