

# Review of: "Generic Competences in University Students from Barranquilla, Colombia"

Martín Martín-González<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Europea de Madrid

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

- The article is interesting, and I think it is a first step that should be used to continue advancing on the subject.
- In terms of references, I think it is necessary to include some important ones that give it more strength and some more international ones. It would be interesting to explore works such as those of González and Wagenaar, Rycken and Salganik, Allen and van der Velden, Bunk, Fugate, Kinicki and Ashfort, Tomlinson, Crossman and Clarke, etc. I do not know if perhaps works by Biggs, Entwistle and Ramsden, Marton and Säljö,..., fit in when discussing the student-centered learning approach. Martín-González, Ortiz, and Jano also delved into the impact of teaching methodologies on acquired competences, which could be interesting. These are just a few suggestions that may (or may not) be appropriate to make it more robust.
- Citing references from other works, such as Wattiez Franco, should be avoided. The original sources were used in this study.
- The abstract is imprecise. I would recommend brevity and concreteness, without adding citations.
- At some points, it seems that the paper will use data from the tuning project rather than using it as a comparison. I think that the use of your own survey should be clarified from the beginning.
- When they talk about the REFLEX project in the methodology, it is not clear what the purpose of quoting it is or why it is described in detail. I think it would be better to go into the questions you asked rather than those asked by another REFLEX project. On the other hand, you could also cite the European Tuning Project, which I imagine is the main predecessor of the Alfa Tuning Latin America Project (this is conjecture, but I imagine it comes from the European one as it has the same name).
- The "discussion and conclusion" are not truly a discussion. I would call it just a conclusion or, rather, "concluding remarks." The discussion seems to fit more in the Results section, as you have organized it.
- The way the results in Table 2 are presented does not allow us to see the differences from Table 1. Perhaps, more visually appealing and informative forms should be explored.
- The discussion could be improved with a little more depth, perhaps by including important authors in the citations. More advanced methodologies should be explored in the future.