ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received:02/11/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:03/11/2016
Manuscript Title: LA GESTIÓN ADMINISTRATIVA DE PROGRAMAS DE EDUCACIÓN A DISTANCIA CON MEDIACIÓN VIRTUAL EN UNIVERSIDADES DE COLOMBIA	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**5**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	*5*
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	**x**
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

We are facing a very well structured with a good definition dle problem, objectives and statistical data applied to the article.

This is an excellent article

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: