

Paper: “Hacia un Modelo de Medición del Desempeño Organizacional en las Micro y Pequeñas Empresas del Sector Manufacturero en México”

Submitted: 02 November 2022

Accepted: 27 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Corresponding Author: Ricardo Gallegos Murillo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n7p119](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n7p119)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Bertha Alicia Arce Castro
Universidad Veracruzana, México

Reviewer 3: Favio Farinella
National University of Mar del Plata, Argentina

Reviewer 4: Angelica Sterling
Universidad del Caribe, 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: Bertha Alicia Arce Castro	
University/Country: Universidad Veracruzana , México	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Si.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Si cumple	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No, el articulo esta bieneditado y el autor cuidó del uso de reglas gramaticales	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Si , el metod variavles utilizadas son explicadas ampliamente	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Los resultados son claros y no contienen errores Los resultados son tratados exhaustivamente y explicados	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Las conclusions son claras y cumplen con el objetivo propuesto	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Las referencias son actuales y de calidad	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

El trabajo de nvestigacion, es de calidad y creo que deberia continuar con su estudio y realizar un comprativo de resultados en otras entidades o lugares, para estudiar el comportamiento de las variables en el futuro

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

El aticulo es de calidad y considero que puede publicarse

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Angelica Sterling	
University/Country: Universidad del Caribe, México	
Date Manuscript Received: January 24 th	Date Review Report Submitted: February 2 nd
Manuscript Title: Towards a model for measuring organizational performance in micro and small companies in the manufacturing sector in Mexico	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 56.11.2022	
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.	4
<i>Si, el título provee una clara idea de lo que contiene el artículo</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Si los presenta, sin embargo, se puede ampliar la información de los resultados obtenidos y, si se acepta la revisión referente al modelo propuesto incluida en los comentarios del documento, ajustarlo en el resumen</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Si, están marcados como observaciones dentro del documento</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Si, solo falta agregar información de la depuración de los sujetos de estudio</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Hace falta agregar más de los resultados obtenidos, sobre todo, los que se referencian en el apartado de la discusión, más observaciones en el documento</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Presenta conclusiones de resultados que no se incluyen ampliamente en el apartado correspondiente, se enfoca principalmente en el indicador de capacitación, sin embargo, se deberían incluir todos y agregar la conclusión del estudio en su totalidad</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Si, solo hay algunas citas que no se encuentran en la lista de referencias y viceversa, marcadas con verde en el documento.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Es un muy buen trabajo y la información es importante, se sugiere que todo lo relacionado con la información incluida en la propuesta derivada de otros autores, se cite como tal y se incluya en el marco teórico. Con esto se podrá dar espacio a presentar el modelo propuesto ya más enfocado a las empresas objeto del estudio de una manera más particular. Asimismo, hace falta afinar detalles de redacción e inclusión de información que se mencionan en las observaciones del documento.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: