

Paper: “La Certificación Orgánica del Camarón de Exportación como Estrategia de Diferenciación en los Mercados Internacionales”

Submitted: 08 November 2020

Accepted: 07 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Maryuri Vanessa Suárez Zaruma

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n34p166

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Antonio Solís Lima
Tecnológico Nacional de México campus Apizaco, México

Reviewer 4: Gabriel Anibal Monzon
Universidad de Moron, Argentina

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 24-11-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 25-11-2020
Manuscript Title: Organic Certification as a Differentiation Strategy. Challenges and Opportunities for Shrimp Exporting Companies	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 11141/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> /No	

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>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There were minimal grammatical errors in the manuscript. Errors were marked in the original document.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The study methods were mentioned, but not explained.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results were not clear because they were not contrasted against the research questions.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported	3

by the content.	
<i>The conclusions were not accurate because the research methodology was neither explained nor supported.</i>	
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	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is advisable that the applied research methodology in this research must be backed up. That is, you could cite some authors that have applied such a methodology, successfully, in others similar jobs.

Also, it is recommendable to justify statistically the sample of the ten papers used for getting to your conclusions. That is, why not to use 20 papers instead of ten, or five instead of ten.

Last, in order to achieve excellent conclusions, it is advisable that all the information must come from papers instead of government statistics.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It is advisable that this manuscript is not published until the comments a suggestions are attended.

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: GABRIEL ANIBAL MONZON	Email:
University/Country: UNIVERSIDAD DE MORON - ARGENTINA	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/11/2020
Manuscript Title: La Certificación Orgánica como Estrategia de Diferenciación. Retos y Oportunidades para las Empresas Exportadoras de Camarón	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 141.11.2020	
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>Yes, it is very clear and adequate</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
Yes. The abstract is clear!	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The article doesn't have grammatical errors</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>They are explained clearly</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The body of the paper is clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes! They are correct!!</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are excellent!!!!</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):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication. --

(2) Changes which must be made before publication --

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: --