
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 teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 12-12-2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 13-12-2016
Manuscript Title: ANÁLISIS DE REPRESENTACIONES GRÁFICAS CARTESIANAS EN LIBROS DE TEXTO DE BIOLOGÍA CARTESIAN GRAPHIC REPRESENTATIONS ANALYSIS IN TEXTBOOK OF BIOLOGY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: d121.	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint 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>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	4
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	4

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
<p>The text improved in understanding if some examples of images were present. For example, images of “Ilustraciones inoperantes” and “Ilustraciones operativas” (see “Funcionalidad” Table 5, pag. 14).</p> <p>It is somewhat surprising that the text analyzes images and there is no example in the whole work.</p> <p>At least a couple of examples should illustrate the work. Citing the origin, there is no problem in reproducing those images.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
<p>Review some bibliographical citations that do not appear in the text or in the final references (By example D’Amore, 2006; Perez Vadillo 2013, Mares, Rivas y otros 2006).</p> <p>Modify the Jimenez Tejada citations as discussed in comments and suggestions to the authors (see below).</p>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The first Jimenez Tejada 2009 citation (p.3, line 4) in the text is correct, but the second and third reference (p.3, line 27 and p.4, line 2) must be changed.

The reference on page 3, line 27 should be changed to the following reference:

María-Pilar Jiménez-Tejada, Cristina Sánchez-Monsalve and Francisco González-García (2013) How Spanish primary school students interpret the concepts of population and species, Journal of Biological Education, 47:4, 232-239, DOI: [10.1080/00219266.2013.799081](https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2013.799081)

The reference on page 4, line 2 should be changed to the following reference:

Jiménez-Tejada, M.P., F. González-García and J. A. Hódar. (2008). El aprendizaje del concepto biológico de población: cómo pueden las ciencias sociales y las matemáticas colaborar con la didáctica de la biología. Didáctica de las Ciencias Experimentales y Sociales, 22 (1): 103–114.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

