
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: 27/05/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 29/05/2017
Manuscript Title: Análisis de la tutoría en el Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Escárcega. Analysis of the tutoring at the Superior Escárcega Technology Institute	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0611/17	

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
<i>The title is related to the body of work since specifies clearly intended to 'pr which was carried out the research.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract of the work includes the essential elements to understand the intention of the work, specifies clearly each of the elements as it is the object, method and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The work does not have faults of orthographies, not grammatical, care okay this aspect.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Studio method is specified in the body of the work as well as the development of research.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4

<i>The body of the work is clear and errors giving direction to research is cared.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion of the work supports the content of the same, as well as Specifies the importance of the implementation of mentoring in the Technology.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are appropriate for the development and understanding of the work done.</i>	

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):

Very good job, the suggestion is that you study more the format APA.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Excellent scientific work give a great opportunity to publish articles scientists to teachers who are working against group since there is where new learning connections are generated.

