

Manuscript: “**Detección De Perfiles De Rendimiento Académico En La Universidad Nacional Del Este De Paraguay**”

Submitted: 07 November 2020

Accepted: 04 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: La Red Martínez David L.

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p138

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Marco Tulio CerónLópez,
Universidad IEU (Instituto de EstudiosUniversitarios), México

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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: Marco Tulio CerónLópez	Email:
University/Country: Universidad IEU (Instituto de EstudiosUniversitarios) / México	
Date Manuscript Received:12/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/11/2020
Manuscript Title: Detección de Perfiles de RendimientoAcadémico enla Universidad Nacional del Este de Paraguay	

ESJ Manuscript Number: 135.11.20
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There is a clear relationship between the title of the paper and the development of it.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, they are clear	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are no errors, it is written correctly	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods, if they are clearly explained.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are no errors, it is written correctly	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The results are clear and are explained in the body of the paper.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):