



Paper: “Chemical Characterization of the Essential Oil of Syzygium Aromaticum and its Antimicrobial Activity Against A Probiotic Lactobacillus Acidophilus”

Corresponding Author: Ismael Montero Fernández

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n15p33

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Manuel Gonzalez Perez, Universidad Popular Autónoma Del Estado De Puebla

Published: 31.05.2020

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: Dr. Manuel González Pérez	Email:
University/Country: UNIVERSIDAD POPULAR AUTÓNOMA DEL ESTADO DE PUEBLA	
Date Manuscript Received: 28 March 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: March 26, 2020
Manuscript Title: Chemical characterization of the essential oil of Syzygium aromaticum and antimicrobial activity against a probiotic Lactobacillus acidophilus	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0422/20	
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.	3
<i>The title of the article contains a general synonym instead of the substance studied "eugenol". It is suggested that "essential oil" be changed to "eugenol"</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>The abstract has more than 20 grammatical and punctuation errors.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>In total, the article has more than 92 grammatical and punctuation errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Very good</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The logical structure of the article is very good</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion is poor.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references are very old</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):

In total, the article has more than 92 grammatical and punctuation errors. A thorough review of English is recommended; preferably by one of the English-speaking authors. Another suggestion is that, it be published in Spanish. The subject is interesting, the logical structure is good, but the English language is very poor.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The methodological structure of the article is very good; The topic is very interesting; but their English language is very poor. A very thorough review of English is recommended. Another recommendation is that the article be published in Spanish. The article can be re-entered.