

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: 22-Feb-2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 22-Mar-2017
Manuscript Title:	
Desarrollo de un Sistema Experto para mejorar la asignacion del docente a las diferentes catedras en la Facultas de Informática Y Electrónica utilizando el Modelo de MYCIN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 134.02.2017	

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.

<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.	4
<i>The title is according to content of the article, however there is a misspelling. It should be ""FACULTAD"" instead of "FALCUTAS"</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<p>The author makes a description of expert system development, which show the teacher placement to different subjects in a faculty using MYCIN Model. Topics such as Microsoft solutions framework methodology to document, tools programming language and others were used for its development. Then after analyzing the results, it is concluded the automated process exceeds 60% to the manual process....".</p> <p>The abstract of the manuscript is not proper organized. For example, in the first part, author puts the aim of the work together the method that was used the problem. Some of the paragraphs are not connected each other, so it is hard to interpret some of the ideas posed. I suggest that author works on organize the abstract in order to improve it.</p>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
In general, there are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. I suggest doing a proof of reading in order to improve the clarity of the manuscript.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
In order to document the system, the Microsoft solutions framework methodology is described. However, the reviewer does not find the application the MYCIN model. I recommend that could add a method, which could describe the teacher placement to different subjects in the faculty together with the application of MYCIN model.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<p>The body of the manuscript is not proper organized. For example, in the first part, in the Introduction there are not references. After, in the development of research part, it describes about Methodological operation, development of system expert, description of problem, Scope and objective of the problem, and the steps of software development. There are too many sub titles, so it is hard to interpret some of the topics posed.</p> <p>I suggest that author works on the following sections: the introduction, methodology, results and conclusions. All content should be organized in their respective sections to properly improve its understanding.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
The conclusions confirmed that the automated process exceeds 60% to the manual process disclosing the subject placement process has improved significantly using the expert system proposed. It is assumed that this conclusion is based on data analysis, but due not to have clearly defined the problem and not to be clearly justified the research questions, so I consider that conclusions are not sufficiently grounded.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<p>There is absolutely no reference in the document, although the bibliography is described at the end of the manuscript.</p> <p>I suggested to check some of the references, because they are web pages, which are not supported scientifically.</p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In general, the clarity of the manuscript is not adequately organized and is somewhat confusing to read, because it is not well structured. For example, the definition of the problem is not grounded,

there is not the literature review, there are not the results and discussion sections. In some part of manuscript, some results are presented, but these do not have connection to the research problem.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I consider the work needs major revision. My recommendation is that author carry out a major revision of the work presented and resubmission.

