



Paper: “Relación entre Engagement Académico y Rendimiento Académico en Estudiantes de Enfermería de una Universidad Pública”

Submitted: 20 June 2025

Accepted: 04 September 2025

Published: 30 September 2025

Corresponding Author: Ruth Magdalena Gallegos Torres

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n27p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Eliazar Gonzalez Carrillo
Universidad Autónoma de Chihuahua (UACH), Mexico

Reviewer 2: Sergio Quiroz
Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco, México

Reviewer 3: Jesus Ocana Zuniga
Universidad de Ciencias y Artes de Chiapas (UNICACH), Mexico

Formulario de Evaluación de Manuscritos de ESJ 2025

Este formulario está diseñado para resumir la revisión por pares del manuscrito que ha completado y para asegurar que haya considerado todos los criterios apropiados en su revisión. Su revisión debe proporcionar una declaración clara a los autores y editores de las modificaciones necesarias antes de que el documento pueda ser publicado o las razones específicas para el rechazo.

Por favor, responda dentro del tiempo señalado para que podamos dar a los autores respuestas y comentarios oportunos.

NOTA: ESJ promueve el procedimiento de revisión por pares basado en la validez científica y la calidad técnica del documento (no en el impacto percibido). Tampoco se requiere que haga una corrección de pruebas del documento. Podría recomendarse como parte de la revisión. Los derechos de autor del informe pertenecen al editor y los datos pueden ser utilizados con fines de investigación.

***La oficina editorial de ESJ desea expresar su especial gratitud por su tiempo y esfuerzos.
¡Nuestro equipo editorial es una razón sustancial que hace que ESJ se destaque del resto!***

Nombre del Revisor: Eliazar Gonzalez Carrillo	
Universidad/País:	
Fecha de Recepción del Manuscrito:	Fecha de Envío del Informe de Revisión: 30 /07/2025
Título del Manuscrito: Relación entre educativo y rendimiento académico en estudiantes de enfermería de una universidad pública	
Número de Manuscrito de ESJ:	
Usted acepta que su nombre sea revelado al autor del documento: SI	
Usted aprueba que su nombre como revisor de este documento esté disponible en el “historial de revisión” del documento: SI	
Usted aprueba que este informe de revisión esté disponible en el “historial de revisión” del documento:	

Criterios de Evaluación:

Por favor, dé a cada ítem de evaluación una calificación numérica en una escala de 5 puntos junto con una explicación detallada para cada punto de calificación.

<i>Preguntas</i>	<i>Resultado de la Calificación [Malo] 1-5 [Excelente]</i>
1. El título es claro y adecuado al contenido del artículo.	5
2. El resumen presenta objetivos, métodos y resultados.	5
Se encontró algunos párrafos que no había oherencia y en presente se modificaron a tiempo pasado	

3. Hay pocos errores gramaticales y errores ortográficos en este artículo.	4
No hay errores gramaticales ni ortográficos pero tres observaciones importantes, mencionan que el engagement tiene su raíz en el y “Burnout”, le dedicand bastante espacio a este síndrome párrafos que deben expresar más información sobre el engagement y las citas que van dentro del texto solo el año va dentro del parentesis la que van al final estan bien y finalmnete no expresa el problema que dio origen a la investigación	
4. Los métodos del estudio están claramente explicados.	4
<i>falto el enfoque, la población tipo de muestreo y explicar y el plan de análisis</i>	
5. Los resultados son claros y no contienen errores.	4
<i>Creo que aquí la Fuente es el cuestionario lo demas bien</i>	
6. Las conclusiones o el resumen son precisos y están respaldados por el contenido.	5
<i>Si existe respaldo</i>	
7. Las referencias son completas y apropiadas.	4
<i>Revisar a los autores en que sus dos apellidos no estan separado por un guion como en en el caso del N° 3,4,7, 11, 12,15,17 y existen algunas de más de 5 años</i>	

Recomendación General (marque con una X su recomendación):

Aceptado, no necesita revisión	
Aceptado, necesita una revisión menor	X
Devolver para una revisión mayor y reenvío	
Rechazar	

Comentarios y Sugerencias para los Autores:

relalizar los cambios sugeridos y considerar que el término correcto para los participantes es estudiante porque es nivel superior

Comentarios y Sugerencias Solo para los Editores:

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes—the title is clear and appropriate to the article’s content.

It names the two core variables (academic engagement and academic performance), the target population (nursing students), and the setting (a public university).

The stated objective—evaluating the relationship between engagement and performance—matches the title, and the methods/results address that objective.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The summary clearly presents the objective, methods, and results: the objective is explicit (“to evaluate the relationship between the level of educational engagement and academic performance”), the design and analysis are described (cross-sectional study, EMMEE instrument with $\alpha=0.91$, χ^2 in SPSS v25), and the results report sample size, key characteristics, and the main finding of no association; it also includes a conclusion and keywords.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

English title (wording & preposition)

“Academic engagement and academic performance relation in nursing students from a public university”

“Relationship between academic engagement and academic performance among nursing students at a public university.”

Term consistency (Abstract & keywords)

You alternate between “academic engagement” and “educational engagement.” Use a single term throughout (recommend academic engagement).

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Largely clear and adequate, with identifiable design, setting, instrument, outcome definition, ethics, and analysis. A few clarifications would strengthen transparency and reproducibility.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The narrative is generally understandable and aligned with the aims, but the body contains several typographical, formatting, and consistency issues that should be corrected before publication.

Major clarity/consistency points (actionable):

Tables — numeric/formatting errors. In Table 3 (plan 2023, “Empleo: Sí”), the percentage reads “226.5” instead of “26.5”; several percentages display excessive precision (“52.54”, “10.20”, “32.65”, “49.23”). Please correct the typo and standardize decimal places across tables (e.g., one decimal).

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion reflects the study aim but does not explicitly restate the main empirical finding (no association between engagement dimensions and GPA), and it makes program-level inferences that are only modestly supported by the data.

Results sections clearly report no statistically significant association between engagement dimensions and GPA. The abstract and body both note this.

The abstract conclusion (“The study of educational engagement provides valuable insights...”) is too broad and does not summarize the main null finding or any quantitative result; it should be aligned with the reported absence of association.

The final Conclusions section emphasizes curricular-plan “dynamic” differences between cohorts at different stages of training, but this interpretation is not fully developed statistically. Only the Context dimension shows a plan-of-study association ($\chi^2=4.68$; $p=0.030$), whereas other dimensions do not; thus generalizing to a broad “dynamic” change needs caution and effect-size context.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Appropriate but not fully comprehensive. The list covers regional evidence on engagement/burnout and cites the EMMEE validation you used, which is essential. However, several foundational works and recent syntheses on student/academic engagement are missing, and there are formatting/DOI issues that need correction.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript addresses a relevant question in nursing education and is generally well structured. With targeted edits to reporting, language, and tables—and a tighter alignment between results and conclusions—the paper can meet publication standards.

Title & Abstract. The title is clear and appropriate. The Abstract presents objective and methods, but the conclusion should explicitly reflect the main finding (no association between engagement and academic performance) and quantify the core result (χ^2 , df, N, exact p). Please add data-collection dates and unify terminology (use “academic engagement” consistently).

Methods. Improve transparency by specifying the sampling frame (census vs convenience), recruitment procedures, inclusion/exclusion criteria, response rate, and handling of missing data. State $\alpha = 0.05$ (two-sided), indicate use of Fisher’s exact when expected counts < 5 , and report an effect size (Cramér’s V). Provide reliability in this sample (Cronbach’s α for each dimension). Clarify the source of GPA (self-report vs official records) and justify GPA cut-points.

Results & Tables. Correct the typographical error “226.5%” (should be 26.5%) and standardize decimal precision (e.g., one decimal place) across percentages. Harmonize terminology (e.g., “courses not passed” vs “failed courses”) across text and tables. Clean spacing and ensure consistent χ^2 notation (include df and p).

Discussion & Conclusions. State plainly that no significant association was found between engagement dimensions and GPA. Avoid broad curricular generalizations unless supported by analysis; note that only the Context dimension differs by plan, and provide an effect size. Acknowledge the bivariate nature of the analyses or add an ordinal logistic regression adjusting for sex, semester/plan, and employment.

Language & Style. In Spanish sections, prefer the impersonal construction (e.g., “Se encuestó a 114 alumnos”) and correct “se les dio” (no accent). Improve the English title phrasing and standardize keywords (lowercase; separated by semicolons).

References. Appropriate but incomplete: fix malformed DOIs, standardize diacritics, and add foundational engagement frameworks (Fredricks, Kahu, Kuh, Tinto), UWES/UWES-S development papers, recent reviews (2020–2025), and STROBE.

Recommendation. Accept after minor–moderate revisions focused on reporting completeness, numerical/style corrections, and bibliographic strengthening.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

El título es adecuado, sin embargo, sugiero traducir al español por completo
The title is clearly, however, I suggest translating it into Spanish completely.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

El resumen es adecuado.

The abstract is correct.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

El artículo está correctamente escrito y tiene errores gramaticales y de sintaxis mínimos.

The paper is correctly written, but has minimal grammatical and syntax errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

El apartado de método debe reescribirse

I suggest that the method section should be rewritten.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

El trabajo es claro y tiene errores mínimos.

The work is clear and has few errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Las conclusiones deberían evitar el tono prescriptivo y profundizar en torno a los hallazgos del trabajo. Se sugiere revisar.

Conclusions should avoid a prescriptive style. Please discuss the results only.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Referencias correctas.

References OK.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Estimados autores. El trabajo es interesante y sostiene un estilo correcto tanto en forma como en fondo. Sin embargo considero que hace falta atender algunas deficiencias, principalmente la que tiene que ver con las del apartado de método para que su texto sea consistente y meritorio para ser publicado.

Respetuosamente.
