



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Creatividad e innovacion digital en la practica docente del nivel superior: caso del Instituto Tecnologico de Chihuahua II”

Submitted: 08 June 2026

Accepted: 15 August 2026

Published: 31 August 2026

Corresponding Author: Miriam Abigail García

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n22p28

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Maria Aránzazu Calzadilla Medina
University of La Laguna, Spain

Reviewer 2: Nicolas Ariel Santana
Instituto de Enseñanza Superior N° 1 – Alicia Moreau de Justo, Argentina

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: Nicolás Santana	
University, Country: Alicia Moreau de Justo, Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/07/26	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/08/26
Manuscript Title: CREATIVIDAD E INNOVACION DIGITAL EN LA PRACTICA DOCENTE DEL NIVEL SUPERIOR: CASO DEL INSTITUTO TECNOLOGICO DE CHIHUAHUA II	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---26.---60.06.2026---	
You agree that 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: Si	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Si	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	

<i>Si, el título es claro. Incluye los conceptos centrales, el objeto de estudio y el instituto sobre el cual se va a trabajar.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	
<i>Si. Presenta los objetivos de forma clara. También se explica de manera correcta la metodología. Con respecto a los resultados, aporta datos cualitativos y cuantitativos sobre la investigación que fundamentan las conclusiones.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>El artículo está bien escrito, no posee errores gramaticales.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>Los métodos de estudio se explican claramente y están bien fundamentados.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>Los resultados son claros, sin embargo, no se pueden observar algunos de las tablas de las que habla (4.1 y 4.2 por ejemplo). Tampoco se presentan citas de las entrevistas.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Las conclusiones y el modelo utilizado responden al problema planteado.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>No es consistente la metodología de citado (el modelo TPACK (Mishra y Koehler, 2006), el marco DigCompEdu. (Redecker, 2017), los estudios sobre creatividad educativa de (Torrance 1974) y (Craft ,2005), así como los aportes de Rogers (2003) y (Fullan 2016) sobre innovación educativa.)</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):

El trabajo resulta sumamente interesante y presenta objetivos y conclusiones claros y bien delimitados. Sin embargo, es necesario homogeneizar el sistema de citación de los autores utilizando un único criterio normativo (por ejemplo, normas APA). Por otro lado, en el cuerpo del texto se hace referencia a tablas que no están incluidas en el documento (por ejemplo, las Tablas 4.1 y 4.2).

Finalmente, se recomienda fortalecer la fase cualitativa dando mayor peso al análisis de las entrevistas mediante la inclusión de testimonios o fragmentos textuales significativos de los docentes.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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!

Date Manuscript Received: 26-07-2026	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: CREATIVIDAD E INNOVACION DIGITAL EN LA PRACTICA DOCENTE DEL NIVEL SUPERIOR: CASO DEL INSTITUTO TECNOLOGICO DE CHIHUAHUA II	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0660/26	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	5
The title accurately reflects the object of study, the institutional context, and the main variables analyzed (creativity and digital innovation in teaching practice).	

2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
The abstract is well structured and includes the research problem, objective, methodology (sequential explanatory mixed-methods approach), main results, and conclusions. In addition, it incorporates relevant keywords.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Although the writing is generally clear, several aspects should be corrected before publication: • Unnecessary repetitions of ideas and paragraphs, especially in the results section. • Inconsistencies in the formatting of bibliographic citations (for example, inconsistent use of parentheses, authors, and years). • Some punctuation and style errors. • References that appear merged with others (for example, references 15, 22, and 23). • Some expressions could be made more academic and concise.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The methodology is sufficiently described, indicating the paradigm, design, sample, instruments, validation, and data analysis procedure. However, it would be advisable to: provide a stronger justification for the sample size (20 instructors); explain in greater detail the procedure used to select the interview participants; and clarify some aspects of the statistical analysis performed.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are understandable and consistent with the objectives of the study. However, some aspects could be improved: • There are some redundancies in the interpretation of tables and results. • Some statements are overly general. • Additional information supporting some interpretations is needed.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The bibliography is up sufficient to support the study, including recent references (2023 and 2024) and relevant authors in the fields of digital competencies and educational innovation. However:	

- The reference formatting should be carefully reviewed to ensure full compliance with the citation style required by the journal (APA or another specified style).
- There are combined or incomplete references that require correction.
- It is recommended to standardize the presentation of authors' names, editions, and publishing information.

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):

Aunque la redacción es, en general, clara, deben corregirse varios aspectos antes de la publicación:

- Repeticiones innecesarias de ideas y párrafos, especialmente en la sección de resultados.
- Inconsistencias en el formato de las citas bibliográficas (por ejemplo, uso irregular de paréntesis, autores y años).
- Algunos errores de puntuación y estilo.
- Referencias que parecen fusionadas con otras (por ejemplo, las referencias 15, 22 y 23).
- Algunas expresiones podrían reformularse con un estilo más académico y conciso.

La metodología está suficientemente descrita, indicando el paradigma, el diseño, la muestra, los instrumentos, la validación y el procedimiento de análisis de datos. No obstante, sería recomendable:

- Proporcionar una justificación más sólida del tamaño de la muestra (20 docentes/instructores).
- Explicar con mayor detalle el procedimiento utilizado para seleccionar a los participantes de las entrevistas.
- Aclarar algunos aspectos del análisis estadístico realizado.

Los resultados son comprensibles y coherentes con los objetivos del estudio. Sin embargo, podrían mejorarse algunos aspectos, tales como algunas redundancias en la interpretación de las tablas y los resultados; algunas afirmaciones son excesivamente generales y podría incluirse información adicional que respalde algunas de las interpretaciones realizadas.

La bibliografía es suficiente para respaldar el estudio, incluyendo referencias recientes (de 2023 y 2024) y autores relevantes en los ámbitos de las competencias digitales y la innovación educativa. No obstante:

- Debe revisarse cuidadosamente el formato de las referencias para garantizar el pleno cumplimiento del estilo de citación exigido por la revista (APA u otro estilo especificado).
- Existen referencias combinadas o incompletas que requieren corrección.
- Se recomienda homogeneizar la presentación de los nombres de los autores, las ediciones y la información editorial.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: