

Paper: “Capacidad Antimicrobiana de Cinco Aceites Esenciales de Plantas Aromáticas en Escárcega, Campeche, México”

Submitted: 24 November 2021

Accepted: 09 February 2022

Published: 31 May 2022

Corresponding Author: Blanca del Rosario Martín Canché

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n17p197](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n17p197)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Norma Laura Rodríguez Ávila
Tecnológico Nacional de México/I.T. Chiná, México

Reviewer 2: Román Jiménez Vera
Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco, México

Reviewer 3: Marcel Méndez
Instituto Superior Tecnológico Juan Bautista Aguirre, Ecuador

Reviewer 4: Luis Angel Medina Juárez
Departamento de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas de la Universidad de Sonora, Mexico

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: Marcel Méndez	
University/Country: Instituto Superior Tecnológico Juan Bautista Aguirre/Ecuador	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/04/2021
Manuscript Title: CAPACIDAD ANTIMICROBIANA DE CINCO ACEITES ESENCIALES DE PLANTAS AROMÁTICAS EN ESCÁRCEGA, CAMPECHE, MÉXICO	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06.05.2021	
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

El título si es claro con lo que se intenta exponer en el cuerpo del documento	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
La metodología no es clara y se encuentra dispersa entre los resultados y no en el ítem correspondiente, por lo tanto, los resultados no siguen una estructura ordenada de acuerdo con los objetivos y a la metodología.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Existen varios errores ortográficos y de sintaxis en todo el documento.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
La metodología no es clara y se encuentra dispersa entre los resultados y no en el ítem correspondiente, por lo tanto, los resultados no siguen una estructura ordenada de acuerdo con los objetivos y a la metodología.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Existen elementos en los resultados que no son mostrados, por ejemplo, como se evaluaron los aceites o qué variables fueron analizadas en ANOVA, etc.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Las conclusiones deben indicar de manera clara cuales de los aceites sirvieron como inhibidores de hongos o bacterias, además de cuales aceites mostraron o no mostraron diferentes significativas en el cuadro de ANOVA	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Se recomienda que las referencias sean ingresadas al citador de Word.	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

El trabajo tiene un alto potencial, sin embargo, dentro de la estructura del documento existen varios errores metodológicos que pueden corregirse.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Se sugiere que sean enviadas las correcciones para que el documento vuelva a revisarse.

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: Román Jiménez Vera	
University/Country: Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco / México	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/04/2021
Manuscript Title: CAPACIDAD ANTIMICROBIANA DE CINCO ACEITES ESENCIALES DE PLANTAS AROMÁTICAS EN ESCÁRCEGA, CAMPECHE, MÉXICO	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06.05.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u>	

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.	4

<i>El título se puede mejorar: "Capacidad antimicrobiana de aceites esenciales de plantas aromáticas mexicanas"</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Mejorar la redacción del resumen y resaltar los logros del estudio, así como la aplicación evaluada.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Aunque son pocos los errores, se recomienda revisar la ortografía.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>En resultados se menciona que los extractos se evaluaron en frutas, ese proceso no se encuentra descrito en la metodología, tampoco se comprende el análisis microbiológico visual.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Muy Buenos resultados.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Las conclusiones son claras.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Las referencias son adecuadas.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

El tema es muy adecuado a las nuevas tendencias alimentarias más sostenibles y naturales. Sin embargo, para una mayor comprensión del document, se recomienda estructurar párrafos de menor extensión, aproximadamente entre cinco y seis líneas, ya que resulta cansada la lectura de párrafos demasiado extensos.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

La investigación trata un tema muy importante en la conservación de alimentos mediante extractos naturales. Los consumidores buscan productos tratados con sustancias de origen natural, por lo que se recomienda su publicación. Sin embargo, hay que mejorar la redacción de los párrafos, así como mejorar el resumen.

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: Norma Laura Rodríguez Ávila	
University/Country: Tecnológico Nacional de México/I.T. Chiná/México	
Date Manuscript Received:20/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: CAPACIDAD ANTIMICROBIANA DE CINCO ACEITES ESENCIALES DE PLANTAS AROMÁTICAS EN ESCÁRCEGA, CAMPECHE, MÉXICO	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0506/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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) No observations</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Improve the wording of this section, describing the study problem and the methodology more clearly</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) It is necessary to improve the writing of some sections of the manuscript. The information contained in a paragraph remains to be cited.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) The fundamental sections of the methodology are poorly described. With the information provided, it is not possible to repeat the experiments.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) It is necessary to modify the wording of this section, since there is a lot of information that should be located in the methodology section, making it difficult to understand the data obtained.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Some adjustments are recommended and include more information that justifies the study and more information on the methodology followed.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments) No observations</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Better describe the methodology for obtaining essential oils and antimicrobial capacity. Include all other sections that have been pointed out in the document, which have been wrongly described in the results section. Briefly describe the methodology in the abstract. Cite the indicated information. Improve the writing. Check that scientific names are italicized./ Describir mejor la metodología para la obtención de aceites esenciales y la capacidad antimicrobiana. Incluir todas las demás secciones que se han señalado en el documento, que se han descrito equivocadamente en la sección de resultados. Describir brevemente la metodología en el resumen. Citar la información señalada. Mejorar la redacción. Verificar que los nombres científicos estén escritos con cursivas.