

Paper: "Medición de Emociones en Los Jóvenes Hacia Emprendimientos de Bebidas de Guayusa: Implicaciones de Gestión para la Comercialización de Productos"

Submitted: 25 November 2020 Accepted: 01 November 2021 Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Dayana Jamile Romero Buele

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n39p42

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Valeria Alejandra Santa

Universidad Nacional de Rio Cuarto, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Francis Loayza

ESPOL, 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: Valeria Santa	Email:			
University/Country:Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto - Argentina				
Date Manuscript Received:01/12/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/12/2020			
Manuscript Title: MEDICIÓN DE EMOCIONES EN LOS JÓVENES HACIA EMPRENDIMIENTOS DE BEBIDAS DE GUAYUSA: IMPLICACIONES DE GESTIÓN PARA LA COMERCIALIZACIÓN DE PRODUCTOS				
ESJ Manuscript Number: 45.12.2020				
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

(Please insert your comments)			
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5		
(Please insert your comments)			
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3		
Deberían dar el mismo formato a todo el texto: las citas bibliográficas en el texto tienen un formato diferente, los párrafos no estan alineados correctamente			
Las hipotesis a probar no deben mencionarse en la introducción, deb	en ir antes de los objetivos.		
Los nombre científicos de las especies deben escribirse con cursiva.			
Hay autores citados en el texto que no se encuentran en las refencias bibliográficas, por ejemplo: Roebuck; Carrasquel (2017)			
Hay autores mal citados en el texto, por ejemplo: Manzano, Gavilán, Avello, Abril, & Serra, 2012, pág. 72; Mendoza-Vargas & et al.			
Algunas citas en la bibliografia del trabajo estan mal escritas, por ejemplo: Mendoza-Vargas & et al.(se debe citar a todos los autores en las referencias biliográficas)			
Hay citas bibliográficas que estan en referencia sy no en el texto, por ejemplo: Gascón, A., & Blanco, Y. (2017)			
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5		
(Please insert your comments)			
(Please insert your comments)			
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4		
	resultaos. Se habla de en los resultados, tos ancestrales muestra		
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. Creo que no queda totalmente claro la interpretación de los a diferencias positivas y hay diferencias positivas y negativas además un participante que dijo tener orgullo por los produc una diferencia menor que un aprticipante que dijo no tener o	resultaos. Se habla de en los resultados, tos ancestrales muestra		
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. Creo que no queda totalmente claro la interpretación de los a diferencias positivas y hay diferencias positivas y negativas además un participante que dijo tener orgullo por los producuna diferencia menor que un aprticipante que dijo no tener o se explica 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and	resultaos. Se habla de en los resultados, tos ancestrales muestra orgullo y el resultado no		
 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. Creo que no queda totalmente claro la interpretación de los a diferencias positivas y hay diferencias positivas y negativas además un participante que dijo tener orgullo por los produc una diferencia menor que un aprticipante que dijo no tener o se explica 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. 	resultaos. Se habla de en los resultados, tos ancestrales muestra orgullo y el resultado no		

$\textbf{Overall Recommendation} \ (\text{mark an } X \ \text{with your recommendation}):$

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): No veo como se relaciona el orgullo (según las definiciones dadas en el teto) con el aumento de consumo o la prefencia por un producto determiando. Creo que sería más apropiado hablar de sensación placentera o algún término que exprese major la sensación que tiene el consumidor al probar bebidas en este caso y que lo lleva a elegir una por sobre las otras. Sugiero introducer un nuevo término con su respective definición o aclarar la idea desarrollada, ya que resulta algo confuse.

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: Francis Loayza				
University/Country: ESPOL / Ecuador				
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/02/2021			
Manuscript Title: MEASURINGUAYUSA DRINK'S IMPLICATIONS COMMERCIALIZATION	BRANDS: FOR			
ESJ Manuscript Number: 45.12.2020				
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.

thorough explanation for each point rating.			
Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]		
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3		
(Please insert your comments)	1		
There are to little analysis or discussion about the management implications for product commercialization.			
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5		
(Please insert your comments)			
It is clear, maybe the background could be improved.			
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2		
(Please insert your comments)			
In general, a very long introduction, goes around the same topic many times, disorganized and does not have a common thread that leads the reader towards the objective of this work. I found incomplete paragraphs and misused words.			
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2		
(Please insert your comments) This section is disorganized and presents information on other aspects that are not part of the methodology. Authors must describe chronologically what they did, how they designed and conducting the experiment, what they measured, what data they used, pre-processed it, and how they analyzed it to obtain the results.			
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3		
(Please insert your comments)			
It is not clear how the results were obtained, and therefore it is difficult to know the results clarity.			
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and	2		

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusions are based on results, and is not clear for me why the positive prefrontal asymmetric difference is related to the participant's purchase decision, if it represent only the 40% of the participants.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

3

(Please insert your comments)

I found citations which were not primary sources. Additionally, there were to much in-text citations.

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In this interesting study, the authors present the measurement of emotions through the recording of EEG signals, in order to physiologically quantify the response of the participants when tasting 8 different brands of energy drinks based on Guayusa (holly tree native of the Amazon rain forest). Using the profrontal asymmetric difference, authors found the most popular beverage among participants. Authors conclude that using this methodology it is possible to validate the brand with greater acceptance among participants.

Major changes

Introduction: rewrite the introduction focusing in the background, the state of the art about this kind of experiments and the problem to be solved.

Methods: describe chronologically how the authors went about conducting the experiment, how the data was obtained, how was evaluated the questionnaire, data preprocessing and analyzed to obtain the results.

What's the difference between the beverages and how they were presented to the participants

Results: how the authors obtained the qualitative and quantitative assessment of emotions.

Discussion: it is recommended expand the discussion, interpreting the author's results and with the literature results.

Conclusions: should be focused to the use of this kind of methodology may be useful to determine products with greater acceptance among participants.

minor changes

include captions for figures and tables. For figures appears below the graphic, and for tables, above.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: