

**Paper: “Aprendizaje Activo en la Educación Superior Como Enfoque Pedagógico”**

**Submitted: 31 October 2023**

**Accepted: 09 January 2024**

**Published: 31 January 2024**

Corresponding Author: Nora Robles Lozoya

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n1p17

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Marisa Cecilia Tumino  
Universidad Adventista del Plata, Argentina

Reviewer 3: Diego Enrique Baez Zarabanda  
Autonomous University of Bucaramanga, Colombia

# 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!*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Date Manuscript Received: 16-11-2023  | Date Review Report Submitted: 21-11-2023 |
| Manuscript Title: <b>Analizando el Papel del Aprendizaje Activo en la Educación Superior</b><br><b>Enfoque a partir del docente</b> |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 1132/23  |  |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No  |  |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No                       |  |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: 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><br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|--|---|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> | <b>5</b>  |
| <i>Cumple con lo indicado</i>  |   |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Cumple con lo indicado</i>  |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Cumple con lo indicado</i>  |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>Se recomienda describir con mayor detalle los elementos evaluados de la variable.</i>   |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>Menciona de manera general las herramientas que usan los docentes evaluados pero no se muestra como tal un análisis detallado en que consiste cada una de las herramientas.</i> |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>Se recomienda abordar respecto a que si los docentes evaluados tenían alguna capacitación o conocimiento previo al momento de usar las herramientas.</i>                        |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Cumple con lo indicado</i>  |          |

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

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            | <b>x</b> |
| 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 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: Marisa Cecilia Tumino   |  |
| University/Country: Universidad Adventista del Plata   |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: 24-11-23   | Date Review Report Submitted: 24-11-23 |
| Manuscript Title: Analizando el Papel del Aprendizaje Activo en la Educación Superior Enfoque a partir del docente |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 26.32.11.2023   |  |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No   |  |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No      |  |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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><br>[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|--|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>   | <b>2</b>                                       |
| <i>Se indica que el objetivo de la investigación fue analizar el papel del Aprendizaje Activo en la educación superior a partir del punto de vista y vivencias del docente</i> |  |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <i>pero en realidad se trata sobre el uso de herramientas (que en realidad no son herramientas sino más bien enfoques pedagógicos) de aprendizaje activo. Sugiero revisar el título</i>   |          |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>   |          |
| <i>Luego de atender las recomendaciones, se debe actualizar el resumen.</i>   |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <i>Se recomienda revisar el texto a fin de trabajar la claridad y consistencia del contenido.</i>   |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>  | <b>2</b> |
| <i>El término muestreo no probabilístico aleatorio parece contradictorio porque el muestreo no probabilístico y el muestreo aleatorio son dos enfoques diferentes para seleccionar muestras en una investigación.<br/>Según el texto, La variable evaluada fue el análisis del aprendizaje activo desde la perspectiva de los docentes. No se entiende con claridad ¿Qué se midió? ¿Qué cuestionario se utilizó?<br/>Se deben definir claramente las variables y sus niveles o escalas de medición.<br/>Se debe explicar el objetivo que se persigue en cada prueba estadística aplicada.</i> |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>  | <b>2</b> |
| <i>Los resultados deben ser consistentes con los objetivos que se plantean en el estudio.</i>   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <i>Si bien las conclusiones mantienen coherencia con lo que se analizó, deben revisarse los puntos señalados.</i>   |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <i>Algunos párrafos no están acompañados de la autoría o no se encuentran correctamente citados (por ejemplo "Dirección General @prende.mx, 2021"). Revisar también las entradas bibliográficas puesto algunas que no proveen todos los datos correspondientes.</i>   |          |

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

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

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

Existe una diferencia entre el aprendizaje cooperativo y el aprendizaje colaborativo, aunque a menudo se utilizan de manera intercambiable. Sería recomendable aclararlo.

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



## 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: Diego Báez Zarabanda   |  |
| University/Country: Universidad de Investigación y Desarrollo / Colombia  |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: 24/11/2023  | Date Review Report Submitted: 27/11/2023 |
| Manuscript Title: Analizando el Papel del Aprendizaje Activo en la Educación Superior<br>Enfoque a partir del docente |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 26.---32.11.2023   |  |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>  |  |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</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.

| <b>Questions</b>  | <b>Rating Result</b><br>[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>El título es claro y abarca los elementos contenidos en el artículo.</i>                                       |  |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>   | <b>5</b>                                       |
| <i>El resumen presenta los objetivos, metodología y principales resultados de la investigación en el artículo</i> |  |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>El artículo tiene calidad respecto de su gramática y redacción</i>  |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Presentan con claridad y rigor la metodología empleada</i>  |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>Los resultados muestran el análisis de las variables empleadas con rigor estadístico. Solo se presenta una sugerencia de forma en el apartado de comentarios.</i> |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Las conclusiones están soportadas en los análisis estadísticos presentados y evidencian el alcance del objetivo propuesto.</i>                                    |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Las referencias aplican rigor normativo y soportan teórica y metodológicamente lo desarrollado.</i>   |          |

**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):**

En el apartado de resultados y discusión, se sugiere que la tabla 2. “Centros de los conglomerados finales” tenga numeración para cada conglomerado, y presentarla antes de arrojar los “Conglomerados de K medias” para evitar confusión de los análisis dados.

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