



Paper: “Análisis Organizacional y Financiero del uso de Prácticas Sustentables en Empresas Industriales Hidalguenses”

Corresponding Author: Sergio Demetrio Polo Jimenez

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n22p37

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gabriel Anibal Monzon
Universidad de Morón, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Eleazar Villegas Gonzalez
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, México

Published: 31.08.2020

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: | Email: |
| University/Country: | |
| Date Manuscript Received: July 23, 2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: July 30, 2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Análisis Organizacional y Financiero del uso de Prácticas Sustentables en Empresas Industriales Hidalguenses | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 92.06.2020 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u> | |
| 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)</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. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments) There are several spelling errors, which appear in the revised document in the comments column, attached the file that I have revised.</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

The quality of the manuscript is very good, you just have to correct the errors in the form.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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 Morón. Argentina | |
| Date Manuscript Received: June 29 th , 2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: July 6 th , 2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Análisis organizacional y financiero del uso de prácticas sustentables en empresas industriales hidalguenses | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 92.06.2020 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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, the title is clear and it is adequate.</i> | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |
| <i>Yes, the abstract is very clear in its presentation</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 5 |
| <i>I did not found grammatical errors and spelling mistakes</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>The study methods are explained clearly. I suggest reviewing some formula</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 5 |
| <i>It's very clear</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>Yes, the conclusions or summary are accurate and supported</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 5 |
| <i>Yes, the references are appropriate an comprehensive.</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): The paper is very clear and its development precise. I only recommend reviewing some of the mathematical formulas

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: No comments