

Paper: “Situación de la conciliación laboral y familiar en las PYMES de servicios de la ciudad de Escárcega”

Submitted: 17 May 2024

Accepted: 19 June 2024

Published: 30 June 2024

Corresponding Author: Juan Leonardo Pérez Romero

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n16p22](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n16p22)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Cristian Redi

Fundación de Altos Estudios (UCES), Argentina

Reviewer 2: Elsa Aranda Pastrana

Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, México

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Elsa Aranda Pastrana	
University/Country: Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez/México	
Date Manuscript Received:	
Manuscript Title: Situación de la conciliación laboral y familiar en las PYMES de servicios de la ciudad de Escárcega/ Situation of work-life balance in service SMES in the city of Escárcega	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---29.---05.06.2024	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes, I am.	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes, I do.	

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.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Information is missing.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are few grammatical errors and many spelling mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Partially	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

investigación

error gramatical “se recolectó a base” se está hablando de un plural
empleo es empleó.

Es según López Núñez (2020).

En “Métodos” se repite dos veces conciliación de manera consecutiva.

Medicos debe ser médicos.

¿qué es “estudiantes”?

mimas.

Poner las preguntas del cuestionario, decir cuántas eran, ¿qué objetivos tenían las preguntas?

Unas gráficas de barras serán más ilustradoras.

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Cristian Redi	
University/Country: Fundación de Altos Estudios (UCES). Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/5/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/5/2024
Manuscript Title: Situación de la conciliación laboral y familiar en las PYMES de servicios de la ciudad de Escárcega	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN: 1857-7881 (print)	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: si	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

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.	

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	
En mi opinion, este el problema en el manuscrito. No queda clara la muestra, el método no es posible contrastarlo y los resultados parecen ser de un estudio previo.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
Tiene varios errores gramaticales que he señalado en el texto.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
No, no queda claro la muestra ni los resultados.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
No	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
Al ser un estudio de caso, sin muestras, no alcanza los objetivos	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
No	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Estimados autores, en principio deben saber que las relaciones entre patrones y empleados se discuten al interior de los sindicatos (son estos los encargados de proteger la relación entre trabajo y familia). Dejando esto de lado me pregunto ¿Cómo averiguaron que las empresas investigadas cuentan con “flexibilidad de acuerdos”? Por otra parte, hablan del rol de la mujer, del hombre, sin embargo, no discriminan por género la encuesta, tampoco a cuántas personas entrevistaron, en cuanto tiempo. 220 empresas deben haber brindado mucha información como para agregarlas por porcentajes y nada más. Les aconsejo realizar cuadros, por género, por edad, por estado civil, es decir al no especificar los cuestionarios, poco ayudan los porcentajes. Uds ponen en su trabajo, cito: “La presente investigación es con un enfoque cualitativo de tipo descriptivo” y esto no se observa a lo largo del ensayo.