

Manuscript: “Efecto d Baño Químico Con Ácido Cítrico y Ascórbico, Temperatura y Tiempo de Almacenamiento Sobre el Pardeamiento Enzimático en Persea Americana Mínimamente Procesada”

Submitted: 14 September 2021

Accepted: 30 September 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Lurys Ivette Martinez Marin

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p247](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p247)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Valeria Santa, Universidad Nacional Río Cuarto- Argentina

Reviewer 2: Román Jiménez Vera, Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco / 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 Río Cuarto- Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 2021-09-17	Date Review Report Submitted: 2021-09-21
Manuscript Title: Efecto del baño químico con ácido cítrico y ácido ascórbico sobre el pardeamiento enzimático en Persea americana mínimamente procesada	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 82.09.2021	
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]
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.	4
Algunos nombres científicos no están escritos con cursiva. Sugiero unificar citas en el texto: utilizar “&” o “y”	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Sugiero agregar a la primera tabla de anexos una leyenda	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<p>En Materiales y Métodos se menciona “Para este estudio se emplearon 40 aguacates” y “Se prepararon setenta y dos (72) muestras para analizar...”, mientras que en Discusión se menciona “El estudio se llevó a cabo con 108 porciones de aguacate”.</p> <p>Desde mi punto de vista no está claro que número de muestras se utilice..... De Materiales y métodos entiendo que de 40 aguacates se prepararon 72 porciones, pero de acuerdo a la Discusión no es así...</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<p>Cuando una cita tiene más de dos autores, se debe citar con el nombre del primer autor seguido de “<i>et al</i>” y el año de publicación. Luego en la bibliografía se escriben los nombres de todos los autores. También se debe tener en cuenta que en la Bibliografía no se utiliza “<i>et al</i>”, sino que se deben nombrar a todos los autores aquí.</p> <p>Se cita a Hernández (2009), Campos (2014), Hassan & Dann (2019) y Papagianni (2001) en el texto y las citas no están en la bibliografía.</p> <p>Unificar citas en el texto: utilizar “&” o “y”</p> <p>Hay autores citados en Bibliografía que no se encuentran en el texto. Ej: Díaz, J., Ardila, C., & Guerra, M. A. (2019).</p>	

--

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):

Sugiero subir la Tabla N°1 y colocarla debajo del texto en la cual se la menciona, creo que facilitaría la lectura del trabajo. También, la leyenda de la misma debe ir en la parte superior



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: Vie 17/09/2021 08:19 AM	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Efecto del baño químico con ácido cítrico y ácido ascórbico sobre el pardeamiento enzimático en Persea americana mínimamente procesada.	

ESJ Manuscript Number: 82.09.2021
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</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
<p><i>Se debe mejorar el título ya que no expresa adecuadamente el experimento realizado. Se recomienda incluir la temperatura y el tiempo de almacenamiento: Efecto del ácido cítrico y ascórbico, temperatura y tiempo de almacenamiento sobre el pardeamiento enzimático en Persea americana mínimamente procesada.</i></p> <p><i>The title should be improved as it does not adequately express the experiment carried out. It is recommended to include the temperature and storage time: Effect of citric and ascorbic acid, temperature and storage time on enzymatic browning in minimally processed Persea americana.</i></p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<p><i>Se debe incluir el efecto de todas las variables analizadas. Faltó incluir el efecto de los ácidos evaluados, así como del tiempo de almacenamiento. Sólo se menciona la temperatura.</i></p> <p><i>The effect of all the variables analyzed must be included. It was not necessary to include the effect of the acids evaluated, as well as the storage time. Only the temperature is mentioned.</i></p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p><i>Se recomienda revisar el documento ya que se encontraron errores en la redacción y en la estructura del documento.</i></p> <p><i>It is recommended to review the document as errors were found in the writing and in the structure of the document.</i></p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<p><i>La metodología es adecuada.</i></p> <p><i>The methodology is adequate.</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<p><i>Los resultados se presentan de forma adecuada.</i></p> <p><i>The results are presented appropriately.</i></p>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Se recomienda mejorar el párrafo de las conclusiones. It is recommended to improve the paragraph of the conclusions.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Las referencias son adecuadas. References are adequate.</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):

Se recomienda realizar las correcciones sugeridas, aunque son pequeñas, mejorarán la versión final del documento. De igual manera, se recomienda una mayor contundencia hacia los análisis sensoriales, ya que son una herramienta muy efectiva para conocer las especificaciones de los consumidores.

It is recommended to make the suggested corrections, although they are small, they will improve the final version of the document. In the same way, a greater forcefulness towards sensory analyzes is recommended, since they are a very effective tool to know the specifications of consumers.