

Paper: “Estudio Comparativo en la Calidad Nutricional y Empatique de Galletas de Pulido de Arroz”

Submitted: 15 March 2022

Accepted: 08 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Martha Elena Cervantes Sánchez

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p35](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p35)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Maximiliano Vanoye

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: Maximiliano Vanoye Eligio	
University/Country: Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Escárcega	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/Sept/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/Sept/2022
Manuscript Title: ESTUDIO COMPARATIVO EN LA CALIDAD NUTRICIONAL Y EMPAQUE DE GALLETAS DE PULIDO DE ARROZ	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0362/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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.	4
<i>The job title is clear and precise</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>In summary, define the state or city where the study was carried out, that is, the</i>	

<i>geographical location of the company</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>La grámatica y coherencia del manuscrito es clara</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Be more specific in the bromatological analyzes that were carried out</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>In results, it would be appropriate to compare them with at least two studies</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are in accordance with the proposed objectives</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Appointments are in accordance with the established format</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):

Follow up on the recommendations indicated

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: