

Manuscript: “**Efecto Del Almidón De Plátano Cuadrado Musa Balbisiana Colla En El Rendimiento, Retención De Agua Y Aceptación Sensorial En Jamón Cocid**”

**Submitted: 05 July 2021**

**Accepted: 10 July 2021**

**Published: 31 July 2021**

Corresponding Author: María Concepción de la Cruz-Leyva

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p82

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Valeria Santa, Universidad Nacional Rio Cuarto - Argentina

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

**Reviewer 3:** Mario Adelfo Batista Zaldívar, Universidad Técnica de Manabí, Ecuador

**Reviewer 4:** Rosalva Pérez Morales, México

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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: Valeria Santa	
University/Country: Universidad Nacional Rio Cuarto - Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 07-07-2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Effect of square plantain starch Musa balbisiana Colla on yield, water retention and sensory acceptability in cooked ham	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 47.07.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Hay algunos errors de redacción en el texto. En todas las citas bibliograficas los “ <i>et al</i> ” no estan escritos en cursive.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
En una de las tablas de resultados, los numerous expresados no coinciden con los resultados expresados en el texto. Sugieron mostrar los resultados en formato de table o de gráfico, no de ambas formas	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
Hay citas bibliográficas en en texto que no se encuentras en la bibliografia	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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: 06/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/07/2021
Manuscript Title: Efecto del almidón de plátano cuadrado Musa balbisiana Colla en el rendimiento, retención de agua y aceptación sensorial en jamón cocido	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 47.07.2021	
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: Yes/No	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>El título es adecuado y refleja el contenido del documento. The title is appropriate and reflects the content of the document</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>El resumen está elaborado de manera clara y presenta objetivo, método y</i>	

<i>resultados. The summary is clearly prepared and presents the objective, method and results.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Se encontraron pequeños errores de forma, se sugiere realizar una revisión del documento para corregir los errores. Small form errors were found, it is suggested to review the document to correct the errors</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>El método está explicado de forma correcta y cumple con la explicación de los procesos. The method is explained correctly and complies with the explanation of the processes.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Los resultados son claros, se recomienda corregir pequeños errores. The results are clear, it is recommended to correct small errors.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<i>La redacción de las conclusiones es correcta, sin embargo, se recomienda estructurar la forma. The wording of the conclusions is correct, however, it is recommended to structure the form.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Las referencias son apropiadas. References are appropriate.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

*Se recomienda ajustar el documento a la estructura sugerida por la revista, así como corregir algunos errores de escritura. It is recommended to adjust the document to the structure suggested by the journal, as well as to correct some writing errors.*

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Mario Adelfo Batista Zaldívar	Email:
University/Country: Universidad Técnica de Manabí/ Ecuador	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/07/2021
Manuscript Title: Efecto del almidón de plátano cuadrado <i>Musa balbisiana</i> Colla en el rendimiento, retención de agua y aceptación sensorial en jamón cocido	
<b>ESJ Manuscript Number:</b> 0747/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title fulfills the general norms of the scientific writing.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The ABSTRACT is structured in a correct way in its sections: Introduction, Materials and methods, Results and Discussion</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>In the text of the article problems of number agreement; for example, in the ABSTRACT: “El rendimiento del jamón cocido, se relacionaron positivamente con la concentración de almidón de plátano y el mayor tiempo de masajeo (30 min), donde se obtuvieron los mayores valores (121.4 ± 0.36 %).</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Lack of clarity exists in some parts of the text of the article; for example: in the first paragraph of the INTRODUCTION the authors refer: “Los países consumidores de productos cárnicos son China (27 %), Estados Unidos (16 %), Unión Europea (15 %)…”; however, all the countries of the world consume meat products, not alone those that are related.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>It is recommended not to use the old norms of the inorganic chemical nomenclature, because the IUPAC from the year 2005 intend not to make it; for example: it is suggested to write saltpeter of sodium and not sodium saltpeter.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>In the text of the article redundancies and verbosity appear; for example: “García-Solis et al., (2018) evaluaron el uso de harina de plátano verde para preparar galletas sin gluten con alto contenido de fibra dietética. Los resultados indicaron que la harina de plátano verde se puede utilizar como sustituto de los ingredientes comerciales para producir galletas sin gluten con alto contenido de fibra dietética y un bajo índice glucémico.”</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Some decimal numbers don't fulfill the norms of the scientific writing in Castilian, because they are written with point (.), and not with coma (,) as is correct.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Some orthographic errors exist.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Some measure units are not written according to the International Norma; for example: ml is written when it is mL.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Numbers of a digit are written in number form, and not in letters like it is correct; for example: “...se agitó con una varilla de vidrio por 1 minuto.”</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The comma is used to separate the numbers in classes, when the correct thing is a space; for example: “...se centrifugaron los tubos por 15 min a 10,000 rpm...”</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The first paragraph of the section Results and Discussion should be located in the Introduction.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The conceptualization that is given on sensorial evaluation in the page 10 is suggested that it passes for the INTRODUCTION.</i></li> </ul>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>In the article it is explained with clarity the materials and methods used in the investigation.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>In the fourth paragraph of the page 5 are considered that it should not say: “...eritorbato de sodio (0.3 %) por efecto antioxidante...”, but “...eritorbato de sodio (0,3 %) como antioxidante...” Also, it should be clarified what phosphate it is the one that is present: monobásico, dibásico, of sodium, of potassium, etc. Also, the sum of the mass percents that it are given of the chemical species that are part of the brine (that is a watery breakup) it doesn't give 100%.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Statements that are not sustained exist and verified in the article; for example: “...el valor del pH está asociado con la capacidad de absorción de agua...”</i></li> </ul>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The Conclusions that are enunciated are sustained in the text of the article.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The authors Jiménez-Marín et al., 2019 y Zamora &amp; Mendoza, 2018 they appear</i>	

*mentioned; however, they are not in the bibliographical references.*

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation)

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**



# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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: Rosalva Pérez Morales	Email:
University/Country: México	
Date Manuscript Received: 6-julio-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 14-julio-2021
Manuscript Title: Effect of square plantain starch <i>Musa balbisiana</i> Colla on yield, water retention and sensory acceptability in cooked ham.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: e – ISSN 1857-7431	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>El título se adecua perfectamente al trabajo realizado y de acuerdo con el objetivo y lo descrito en la metodología así como resto del documento. Es claro y bien redactado abarcando los puntos esenciales de la investigación dándonos una idea clara del tema abordado.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>Hay una pequeña introducción al tema. Enseguida se describen claramente el objetivo seguido de metodología la cuál es clara, para finalizar con resultados y conclusiones. El resumen nos da una idea clara y completa de lo que aborda el trabajo de investigación incluyendo todos los puntos importantes de la misma.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>Después de una revisión minuciosa del documento solo se encontraron algunos errores ortográficos que no cambian para nada el contexto o interpretación del trabajo de investigación. Se numeraron los renglones para su fácil identificación.</i></p> <p>Renglón 70: <b>que no se obtienen</b> (Falta la <b>n</b>).</p> <p>Renglón 102: <b>(Ssonko y Muranga, 2017)</b>. Debe ser: (Ssonko &amp; Muranga, 2017).</p> <p>Renglón 134: <b>esta tenía</b>... sería: <b>estas tenían</b>... (En plural)</p> <p>Renglón 138: La abreviación <b>M. balbisiana C</b>, podría referenciarse desde el renglón 131. <b>Los frutos de M. balbisiana Colla (M. balbisiana C)</b> o de otro renglón anterior donde se mencione porque no menciona anteriormente la abreviación.</p> <p>Renglón 153: cuadrado <b>M. balbisiana</b>... Falto la <b>C</b> para que quedara: <b>M. balbisiana C</b>.</p> <p>Renglón 193: <b>comparación medias</b>... comparación <b>de</b> medias. (Falta la palabra <b>de</b>)</p> <p>Renglón 196: Falta punto final del párrafo.</p> <p>Renglón 209: <b>aún</b>, es separado <b>a un</b> tiempo de masajeo...</p> <p>Renglón 250: La palabra: <b>optimas</b>... lleva acento: <b>óptimas</b>...</p> <p>Renglón 324: <b>(Jiménez-Marínet al., 2019)</b>. (Jiménez-Marínet <b>et al.</b>, 2019). (Falta <b>et</b>)</p> <p>Renglón 335: <b>adicionados almidón</b>... Adicionados <b>con</b> almidón... (falta la palabra <b>con</b>)</p> <p>Renglón 346: Detectaron <b>un</b> comportamientos.. (Quitar la palabra <b>un</b> o poner en singular el párrafo: Detectaron un comportamiento similar...).</p> <p>Renglón 349: <b>(Tofiño-Rivera y col., 2017)</b> debe ser: (Tofiño-Rivera <b>et al.</b>, 2017).</p> <p>Renglones 374 y 395: Espacios al inicio. Son la bilbiografía <b>1 y 7</b>.</p>	
<b>4. The study methods eare explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>La metodología es clara. Menciona con detalle las técnicas utilizadas así como las modificaciones a las técnicas originales. De igual manera, el análisis estadístico así como las variables respuestas para cada uno de los análisis son explicados a detalle de tal manera que sea fácil su reproducción.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Los resultados son claros incluyendo los resultados de los análisis estadísticos y están apoyados con figuras para su fácil interpretación. Son completos y se presentan en el orden como se describen en metodología. Son claros y de fácil interpretación. Tienen un aporte importante a la industria alimentaria.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>supported by the content.</b>	
<i>Las conclusiones son claras, precisas y van de acuerdo al desarrollo del trabajo y se presentan en el orden como se presentan los resultados. Nos dan un claro e importante cierre del trabajo resaltando la importancia de los resultados obtenidos.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>La bibliografía está directamente relacionada al trabajo desarrollado. Es apropiada al tema desarrollado y relativamente nueva ya que el 70% pertenece a los últimos 6 años.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

En general el trabajo está muy bien estructurado, es claro y de fácil interpretación, solo atender algunos detalles en ortografía y gramaticales que no cambian para nada el contexto del trabajo y su interpretación. Felicidades por el trabajo de investigación y su importante aporte a la industria alimentaria.