
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: 3/01/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 6/01/2016
Manuscript Title: Intervención Cognitivo-Conductual en Jugadores Mexicanos de Fútbol Profesional.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:0110/17	

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.	5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> El título es claro	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> El resumen y el abstract presentan diferente información, revisar las últimas líneas de cada uno. Se recomienda unificar ambas versiones.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Existen pocos errores ortográficos sin embargo se recomienda revisar detalladamente la gramática	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Se recomienda ampliar esta sección, ya que no queda claro como se realizo el estudio.	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Se presentan algunos errores de redacción , además en este apartado, el autor copia párrafos textuales del Marco Teórico por lo que resulta redundante en esta sección, el autor debe discutir sus resultados con lo que tiene en su MT.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i> Las Referencias son apropiadas sin embargo las que son anteriores al año 2005 debería considerarse sustituirlas por más recientes.	

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):

Revisar el Resumen y abstract, ampliar el procedimiento, y evitar duplicar el texto del MT en el apartado de Discusión. El tema es de gran interés, abre la puerta a futuras investigaciones en México, donde la intervención cognitivo conductual en el ámbito deportivo no ha sido ampliamente estudiada y no se le da la importancia requerida.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

El tema es relevante y de gran interés, es poco estudiado en nuestro país (México), motivo que lleva a sugerir, realizar los cambios pertinentes para una futura publicación.

