

**Paper: “El Inglés Conversacional en Estudiantes de Primer Año de Psicología:
Metodologías y Estrategias en UDELAS Chiriquí”**

Submitted: 11 January 2024

Accepted: 03 September 2024

Published: 30 September 2024

Corresponding Author: Sugely Serrano

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n26p17](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n26p17)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ludwin Estrada

Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Escárcega (ITSE), Mexico

Reviewer 2: Uriel Alejandro Morales Carrera

Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Zongolica, Mexico

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 15-01-2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 17-01-2024
Manuscript Title: Mejora del Inglés Conversacional en Estudiantes de Primer Año de Psicología: Metodologías y Estrategias en UDELAS Chiriquí.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0147/24	
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> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>No se recomienda que el titulo ya este condicionado a que hay una mejora porque se supone que para eso es el análisis, para saber cual será el hallazgo, eso dejarlo al momento de plasmar los resultados. Se recomienda cambiar por: El inglés conversacional en ...</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Cumple con lo indicado</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Cumple con lo indicado</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Menciona en el apartado sobre una variables, pero no menciona cuales son y como se pretende evaluarse. En las técnicas e instrumentos menciona el método para identificar las estrategias metodológicas que que utilizan los docentes, pero no</i>	

<i>menciona cuál será el método para identificar las estrategias adecuadas para ser aplicadas en los talleres, esto último mencionado en el resumen del artículo.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>En los resultados menciona que los resultados de la tabla 1 corresponden a un pretest y la tabla 3 a un posttest, el cuál en la metodología no menciona de algún pretest o posttest y de como se vayan aplicar, de hecho en los resultados existen fragmentos de texto que pudieran servir para redactar ese apartado en la metodología.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Menciona sobre los talleres que ayudaron a mejorar con base a las estrategias, sin embargo valdría la pena mencionar la forma o el cronograma o prorama de como se fueron dando esos talleres.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Valdría la pena nutrir más el apartado de referencias debido a que sólo tiene el registro de 9 consultas bibliograficas. De igual forma se recomienda que el texto esté en color negro y no en azul como aparacen algunas referencias.</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):

Existen algunos párrafos que tiene espacio entre uno y otro, y en otros no hay espacios, tratar de unificar todo el documento, se recomienda tomar en cuenta las observaciones.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 15/01/2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Mejora del Inglés Conversacional en Estudiantes de Primer Año de Psicología: Metodologías y Estrategias en UDELAS Chiriquí	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---22.---47.01.2024	
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> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
<i>The last specific objective is aimed at designing a proposal to improve the level of English, however, result number three does not clearly explain what the intervention consists of. Although there is a proposal, it is not in the results, and the discussion is not oriented to the existing literature on improvement programs in the English language.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Although, if all the sections are described, the methodology speaks of a sample with students and the sampling of teachers is not mentioned.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>If there are spelling and grammatical errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>It uses the Serrano 2021 method as a reference, however, the questionnaire does not clarify the dimensions, the variables, the type of variable, the statistical treatment that will be carried out.</i>	
<i>Objective 2 does not clarify the instrument, the observation guide can identify presence or absence, if it uses a measurement scale to explain the scale and/or the assessment.</i>	
<i>In objective 5, the proposal to improve the program is not located in the results.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The document talks about a general objective and 5 specific ones, the general objective and the title always go hand in hand, perhaps they are not written in the same way, but with the general objective we want to achieve the proposed work. Only three results of the five proposed in the summary are described.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The summary partially has the required elements, but the conclusion repeats the data presented in the results.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Of the 9 references, 8 are cited in the text, only 1 of the 9 are current references (the last five years)</i>	
<i>It is suggested to have more updated references.</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):

Annex the document in word with the comments.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: