

Paper: **“Rendimiento Laboral del Personal de Salud Mental Relacionado con el Riesgo Psicosocial”**

Submitted: 24 October 2022

Accepted: 17 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Maria Teresa Torres Lopez

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n38p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Manuel González Pérez

Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, Mexico

Reviewer 2: Favio Farinella

Universidad Nacional of Mar del Plata, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Reviewer 3: Sofia Zuñiga Alvarado

Centro de Estudios Tecnológicos, industrial y de servicios No. 146, México

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: Dr. Manuel González Pérez		
University/Country: México		
Date Manuscript Received: 11/2/2022	Date Submitted: 11/5/2022	Review Report
Manuscript Title: Rendimiento laboral del Personal de salud mental relacionado con el riesgo psicosocial.		
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 1129/22		
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.

<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>	
Excellent	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>The English are poor.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Yes, there are many errors in the abstract. The abstract (English) requair new traduction</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methods are clear</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are precise</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Excellent</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Good</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Por favor, traducir de nuevo el abstract. Tiene muchos errores la traducción actual.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Favio Farinella	
University/Country: Universidad Nacional of Mar del Plata, Buenos Aires, Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/10/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/11/22
Manuscript Title Rendimiento laboral del personal de salud mental relacionado con el riesgo psicosocial.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 29.11.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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.

<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.	4
El título del artículo sometido a revisión es claro y se adecúa de manera suficiente al contenido. El objeto de investigación precisado consiste en determinar la asociación del rendimiento laboral con los riesgos psicosociales en personal de una unidad de	

salud mental que -se entiende conforme la nacionalidad de los autores- se encuentra en México.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
El resumen transmite de manera clara el objeto, la metodología utilizada y los resultados a los cuales han llegado los investigadores que concluyen afirmando que las demandas de la carga laboral del trabajo activo y apoyo social deben ser monitoreadas respecto del personal de salud, como también que el género no influye en el rendimiento laboral. Conviene situar territorial y temporalmente al lector desde la misma introducción.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Prácticamente no existen errores gramaticales. Puede advertirse en la página 6 donde se lee “El trabajo genera una estabilidad en quien lo desempeñan” que debe adecuarse la frase al plural o singular según corresponda. En la página 8 donde se lee “Se realizo un estudio de tipo cuantitativo” falta el acento. Posiblemente en la página 12, debe utilizarse la contracción “al” donde se lee “con respecto a el rendimiento”.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
La metodología utilizada por los autores en un estudio de campo como el analizado ha sido según ellos afirman, de tipo cuantitativo, no experimental, transversal con alcance correlacional y comparativo, lo cual es adecuado para el tipo de investigación realizada.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Los resultados a los que arriba el grupo de investigación en su trabajo se expresan de manera clara y contundente a partir de la metodología empleada. En este sentido, los gráficos ayudan a comprender los datos duros presentados.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Las conclusiones son presentadas en un apartado propio hacia el final del trabajo tras mencionarse diversas cuestiones de discusión a las que mueven los datos presentados. Los hallazgos a los que arriban los autores son precisos y se fundamentan en la evidencia presentada.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Las referencias bibliográficas son adecuadas pertinentes y conforme el estado del arte de acuerdo al estudio que se realiza.	

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):

Como mencionamos en el punto 1, sería muy interesante conocer el lugar (país, región , etc) donde se llevó a cabo el estudio, como también el período considerado.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Es un estudio actual, preciso y relevante para un campo del medio ambiente laboral que generalmente no es estudiado con la profundidad necesaria..

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: Sofia Zuñiga Alvarado	
University/Country: México	
Date Manuscript Received: November 25, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: December 3, 2022
Manuscript Title: Rendimiento laboral del personal de salud mental relacionado con el riesgo psicosocial.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1857-7431	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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>(The title is correct and appropriate.)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Methods and results are included.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(There is a grammatical error in the second paragraph of page 4. There is a grammatical error on page 6 continuation of the last paragraph of page 5. There are grammatical errors in the first and third paragraph of page 7. There are grammatical errors in the third and fourth paragraph of page 12. There is a grammatical error in the fourth paragraph of page 17. There is a spelling error in the first paragraph of page 18.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Description of the place where the sample was taken for the study is missing. Methods are used correctly.)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(The results show the expected findings)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(The importance of the findings is emphasized and it is motivated to continue venturing into the subject.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(References of the topics on which the study was carried out are correctly included.)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The topics that were studied are of global importance. Talking about occupational health is an essential contribution to the individual well-being of the worker and the effective functioning of companies. Congratulations!!!

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I appreciate your consideration of me as a reviewer. Best regards.