Manuscript: **"Evaluacion del β–Cariofileno sobre el estrés oxidativo de ratones BALB/c con hiperglicemia inducida mediante la administración de estreptozotocina"**

Corresponding Author: Paola Villalobos

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Cuauhtémoc Sandoval Salazar, Universidad de Guanajuato, Guanajuato, México

Reviewer 2: Dr. Manuel González Pérez, TecNM campus Tepeaca

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: Cuauhtémoc Sandoval Salazar	
University/Country: Universidad de Guanajuato, Guanajuato, México	
Date Manuscript Received: January 10, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: January 19, 2022
Manuscript Title: Evaluation of β-caryophyllene on oxidative stress in BALB / c mice with hyperglycemia induced by the administration of streptozotocin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0151/22	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
Yes, is clear and it is adequate	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	**5**

results.	
Yes, it is clear and contains all the required elements	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
Yes, it contains several grammatical errors and need to be corrected	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The methods are clear and present all the experimental techniques used	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
They are clear and well described. It is recommended to care for the quality of the images	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
The conclusion is clear; however, it is recommended to increase the applicative use of β-caryophyllene in other chronic degenerative diseases. This is due to the results obtained	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	

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):
Review some gramatical and abreviation aspects

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: Dr. Manuel González Pérez	
University/Country: TecNM campus Tepeaca	
Date Manuscript Received: 27 enero 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 28 enero 2022
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0151/22	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
Si es claro	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**

El abstract en inglés tiene algunas faltas... ver la corrección.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
Si hay algunos errores en el abstract.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
No hay observación... está correctamente bien explicado.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
Es excelente.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
Si es clara y concisa.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
Hay algunas referencias muy viejas.	

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):
Estimados colegas… el artículo está muy bien escrito, solo corrijan por favor el abstract (inglés) tiene algunas faltas de ortografía.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Este artículo está muy bien estructurado y escrito, solo se necesita revisión en el abstract (tiene faltas de ortografía el inglés).