

Paper: “Reflexiones de Becarios y Becarias a Partir de un Programa Posdoctoral en la Post-Pandemia”

Submitted: 06 July 2023

Accepted: 23 January 2024

Published: 31 January 2024

Corresponding Author: Jorge Antonio Balladares Burgos

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n1p140

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oruam Cadex Marichal Guevara
Universidad de Ciego de Ávila Máximo Gómez Báez, Cuba

Reviewer 2: Blanca Fiallos
Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, Ecuador

Reviewer 3: Francisco Javier Mejia Ochoa
Tecnológico Nacional de México, Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Zongolica,
Mexico

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: Oruam Cadex Marichal Guevara	
University/Country: Universidad de Ciego de Ávila Máximo Gómez Báez	
Date Manuscript Received: 29-09-23	Date Review Report Submitted: 2-10-23
Manuscript Title: <i>Reflections from a postdoctoral program in the post-pandemic era</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---25.---43.07.2023---	
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

The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The study methods are explained clearly.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
the results are clear	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
The references do not comply with APA 7th edition standards, references that have not been cited are presented.	

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):

Corrections should be made, I attach the document with some comments

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Corrections are needed by the authors

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: Blanca Fiallos	
University/Country: Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar Ecuador	
Manuscript Title: Reflexiones a partir de un programa posdoctoral en la post-pandemia Reflections from a postdoctoral program in the post-pandemic era	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Although the article contents reflections of students in a postdoctoral course, they refer to issues related to higher education and the uses of technologies in their academic programs before, during and after the pandemic, making reference to the successful experiences of three countries. For this reason, it is suggested that the title might be adjusted.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
In the case of the Argentine experience, the pre-pandemic, pandemic, and post-pandemic periods are not clearly established. It makes difficult to establish an adequate comparison. For example, in matters such as internet connection, or digital gap for access to higher education.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Some grammatical errors can be perceived. Those appear to be unintentional but should be corrected.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
There is no description about how qualitative information was systematized or which techniques or tools were used in order to process the information.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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 manuscript ought to be standardized. Although it is written by different authors the style should be the same. It can be perceived that there has not been a comprehensive reading and uniformization of the writing and homogeneous use of terminology.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: Francisco Javier Mejía Ochoa	
University/Country: Tecnológico Nacional de México, Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Zongolica	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/01/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/01/2024
Manuscript Title: Reflexiones de becarios y becarias a partir de un programa posdoctoral en la post-pandemia Reflections from postdoctoral fellows in the post-pandemic era	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 43.07.2023	
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>El título "Reflexiones de becarios y becarias a partir de un programa posdoctoral en la post-pandemia es claro y relevante para el contenido del artículo, pues indica que el artículo se centra en las experiencias y reflexiones de becarios y becarias que participaron en un programa posdoctoral en el contexto de la post-pandemia.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>El resumen brinda una visión general de los objetivos y los temas abordados, pero podría mejorarse proporcionando más detalles sobre los métodos utilizados y algunos resultados específicos obtenidos a partir de la investigación. Esto ayudaría a los lectores a comprender mejor la contribución del artículo.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>En general, el artículo presenta pocos errores gramaticales y ortográficos.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>En general, la metodología está bien estructurada, pero algunas áreas podrían beneficiarse de una mayor claridad y detalle para comprender completamente la aplicación de los métodos de estudio.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>En general, los resultados son claros y bien estructurados, pero algunos puntos específicos podrían detallarse más para mejorar la comprensión y la conexión entre las reflexiones finales y los hallazgos específicos.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>En resumen, las conclusiones abordan temas relevantes, pero podrían mejorarse en términos de conexión más explícita con los hallazgos específicos y una transición más suave entre los diferentes temas. La inclusión de ejemplos específicos y referencias a los resultados del estudio podría fortalecer las conclusiones.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>En suma, aunque la bibliografía es extensa y bien estructurada en general, se sugiere agregar el lugar de publicación para los libros y proporcionar fechas de acceso para los recursos en línea.</i>	

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):

- **Claridad en la redacción:** En algunos pasajes, la redacción podría mejorarse para asegurar una comprensión más fluida. Algunas oraciones son extensas y pueden dificultar la comprensión. Consideren dividir las oraciones más cortas para mejorar la claridad.
- **Detalles adicionales:** En la sección de metodología, sería útil proporcionar más detalles sobre las técnicas específicas de observación utilizadas durante la estancia de investigación y cómo se realizaron las entrevistas o cuestionarios.
- **Profundización en resultados:** Los resultados presentados son claros, pero podrían considerar expandir un poco más en las reflexiones derivadas de las categorías de análisis. Proporcionar ejemplos específicos o casos ilustrativos puede enriquecer la comprensión.
- **Coherencia en las tablas:** Asegúrense que la información en las tablas esté presentada de manera coherente y clara. Podría ser útil proporcionar un título más descriptivo para las tablas.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

- In general, this manuscript is well-structured. Once the suggested improvements are incorporated, the article will be ready for publication.