

Manuscript: “Análisis De Las Variables Físico-Químicas Y Microbiológicas De Las Lagunas Del Municipio De Escárcega, Campeche, México”

**Submitted: 03 May 2021**

**Accepted: 21 June 2021**

**Published: 31 July 2021**

Corresponding Author: Blanca del Rosario Martín Canché

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p116

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Laura Cecilia De Luca, Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria. (INTA). Argentina

**Reviewer 2:** Hanníbal Brito, ESPOCH, Ecuador

# ***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: DE LUCA LAURA	
University/Country: Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria. (INTA). Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 11 de mayo	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 de mayo
<b>Manuscript Title: Análisis de la caracterización físico-química y microbiológica de las Lagunas del Municipio de Escárcega, Campeche, México</b> <b>Analysis of the physical-chemical and microbiological characterization of the Lagoons of the Municipality of Escárcega, Campeche, México</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 58.05.2021	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Probablemente “Caracterización y análisis de las variables físico-químicas y microbiológicas dela laguna del municipio de Escárcega, Campeche, México” sea gramaticalmente mas adecuado.	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Deben realizar correcciones las cuales se adjuntan en la copia revisada</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Si los hay</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Si, aunque deben realizar algunos ajustes en el texto.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Los Resultados no presentan errores</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Sugiero rehacer el resumen, ya que es lo que permite a los lectores interesarse – o no- por la lectura complete del artículo. En este caso, presenta algunas falencias. Se adjuntan observaciones y propuestas de modificación en el texto bajo control de cambio.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Faltan referencias bibliográficas</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):**

Realicé las sugerencias en el texto que adjunto. Creo que deben trabajar un poco mas el resumen, incluso las palabras clave, las cuales deben significar algo para los lectores de otras partes del mundo.

En cuanto a las conclusiones y análisis de Resultados deben reweer la propuesta de pasteurización como manera definitiva de saneamiento. Esto no es asi.

# ***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: HANNÍBAL BRITO	
University/Country: ESPOCH/ECUADOR	
Date Manuscript Received: 2021/05/10	Date Review Report Submitted: 2021/05/21
Manuscript Title: Analysis of the physical-chemical and microbiological characterization of the Lagoons of the Municipality of Escárcega, Campeche, México	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 58.05.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

## **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>4</b>
Analysis of the physical-chemical and microbiological characterization of the Lagoons of the Municipality of Escárcega, Campeche, México  <b>I suggest adjusting the theme to:</b> Physical-chemical and microbiological characterization of the water of the Lagoons of the Municipality of Escárcega, Campeche, Mexico. To be related to the development of the manuscript.	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
Meets the established parameters	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
Meets the established parameters	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
Meets the established parameters	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
It must be more specific in the writing of results, in addition, the permissible limits according to the established standard must be located in the same results table.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Must be more specific when writing conclusions	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>They comply with the provisions of the standard</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):**

Consider the requested suggestions.