

Manuscript: **“Preparación y Usos de la Harina de Maíz en Antojitos Regionales en el Municipio de Escárcega, Campeche, México”**

Submitted: 15 April 2021

Accepted: 16 June 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Cecilia del Jesús López Velasco

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p260

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rafael Enrique Meneses Lopez

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: María Leticia Bautista Díaz

Reviewer 4: Ludwin Estrada

Reviewer 5: Paula Viveros

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 22/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/04/2021
Manuscript Title: PREPARACIÓN Y USOS DE LA HARINA DE MAÍZ EN ANTOJITOS REGIONALES EN EL SUR DEL ESTADO DE CAMPECHE, MÉXICO.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0484/21	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> I consider that the title can be improved, since it refers to a region of the state of Campeche. But when reading the content it is understood that the study has only been approached in one municipality, which is a gastronomic area in the state. It is important to redefine it.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The article meets all the requirements.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The article presents some grammatical errors, which have been highlighted in yellow for their prompt correction.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is understood that a methodology was implemented to obtain the results of the study, but it is not specified which method was used, deductive, inductive, hypothetical inductive? The qualitative, quantitative or mixed approach of the study is not indicated either. It is not mentioned what type of study it is: Exploratory, Descriptive, Correlational, Explanatory. It is important to clarify it.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results are very clear, but they do not indicate the application or utility they will have.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is important to improve the writing, since it seems that the interpretation of the data obtained were the conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The bibliographic references that are presented are outstanding and adequate. However, they are somewhat scarce and not all of them are current. It is recommended to add a minimum of 10 bibliographic references with an antiquity of no more than 5 to 10 years.	

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):

I consider it an interesting study that can provide more information, which can be enriched with historical and anthropological information on the gastronomy of your state.

It is preponderant that they mention the relevance of the study, since there is a risk of being superficial, the usefulness of the same and its application is not clear.

Remember, each scientific result must provide a benefit to society, which is the one obtained through this research. They can expand further on this topic.

They can improve the writing style of the article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It is important to review the styles in writing the article.

Likewise, further detail the operating rules for its review.

The information on the form of writing the citations, which edition of the APA is being implemented or which should be evaluated during the review of the received article is not clear.



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!

Date Manuscript Received: 22-04-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 06-05-2021
--------------------------------------	--

Manuscript Title: PREPARACIÓN Y USOS DE LA HARINA DE MAÍZ EN ANTOJITOS REGIONALES EN EL SUR DEL ESTADO DE CAMPECHE, MÉXICO.
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0484/21
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.	3
<i>En el titulo menciona sur de Campeche, siendo estos varios municipios que integran el sur del estado, y en el resumen y objetivo de la investigación solo se limita al municipio de Escárcega.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Cumple con los apartados requeridos en el resumen.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Se recomienda cambiar la palabra “en base” por “con base, sobre la base de, basándose en, etc.”.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Menciona el proceso para llevar a cabo el método, en este caso que solo se utilizó como herramienta de investigación la observación, se recomienda anexar el guión o plan de la observación sistematizada contralada.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Cumple con lo requerido.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Cumple con lo requerido.</i>	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Se recomienda verificar la forma correcta de colocar las citas dentro del texto.</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):

Buen trabajo, se recomienda el uso de mayores instrumentos de recolección de datos para que sea más completa el análisis de la investigación.