



Paper: “Comparación de los recursos naturales de cuatro comunidades del municipio de Escárcega, Campeche”

Submitted: 31 January 2024

Accepted: 04 August 2025

Published: 31 August 2025

Corresponding Author: Martha Elena Cervantes Sánchez

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n22p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Valeria Alejandra Santa
Universidad Nacional de Rio Cuarto, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: 27/01/25	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
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.	4
<i>The title of the article is clear and efficiently delineates the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The abstract focuses mainly on the object. Methods and results are written very vaguely.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The article needs to be proofread. I could find some spelling mistakes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The authors explain that the research has a qualitative focus and used a questionnaire to collect data. They cite some sources to validate the chosen methodology but do not explain the questionnaire and the three experts who validated the instrument in detail. They do not explain what statistical analysis was carried out.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2

<i>The results are not clear. This part is more like a discussion. Tables and graphics mentioned in the methodology should included in this section.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusions are very general and do not reflect the research done.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>There are a few references which are not up to date. Two references are repeated. I suggest using reference management software.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is a good start, but it needs to be thoroughly polished in terms of methodology and results to capture the essence of the research.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/06/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/06/2025
Manuscript Title: Comparación de los recursos naturales turísticos de cuatro comunidades del municipio de Escárcega, Campeche	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09.01.2025	
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. (Please insert your comments)	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments)	5
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Unificar forma de citar autores: en algunos casos se utiliza “y” y en otros “&”	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Hay problemas de redacción que hacen que por momentos el texto sea difícil de comprender y por momentos falto de coherente.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4

<i>Resulta difícil la lectura del texto en algunos momentos</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Hay citas bibliográficas repetidas</i> <i>Hay citas en bibliografía que no se encuentran en el texto</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: 24th january 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 29th january 2025
Manuscript Title: (Comparison of the tourist resources of four communities in the municipality of Escárcega, Campeche)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

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.	2,5

<p>After reading the text you provided, I think the title partially corresponds to the content. Here's why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The title mentions a comparison of the resources of four communities in the municipality of Escaregas, Campeche, which is indeed the object of the study. - However, the text also raises methodological questions, study limitations, and recommendations for improving the research, which are not explicitly mentioned in the title. <p>The relevance of the title is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partially relevant: the title reflects the main object of the study, but does not account for all the aspects addressed in the text. 	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2/5
<p>"The abstract lacks clarity regarding the study's objectives. While it states that the study aims to analyze the natural resources and productive activities of rural communities, it fails to provide a clear explanation of how these objectives will be achieved and what outcomes are expected. Additionally, the summary does not provide adequate information on the methodology used to collect data, which makes it challenging to understand how the results will be obtained. It would be beneficial to elaborate on how this study will contribute to the existing body of literature on rural communities and sustainable development, as well as to discuss the potential implications of the findings for public policy and rural communities."</p>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3/5
<p>the text does not adequately reflect the frequency and severity of spelling and grammar mistake</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2 / 5
<p>The methodology of this text presents several significant limitations and weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of clarity in the research objective: The research objective is not clearly defined. It is mentioned that the research aims to "identify potential tourist routes," but it is not specified what this means exactly. 2. Non-representative Sample: The sample consists of four communities selected randomly, but it is not specified why these communities were chosen and how they are representative of the studied population. 3. Unvalidated measurement instrument: The questionnaire used to collect data was not validated. It is mentioned that the instrument was designed and applied, but it is not specified how it was tested and validated. 	

<p>4. Lack of control over variables: It is not specified how variables were controlled during data collection. It is possible that external variables influenced the results.</p> <p>5. Unclear data analysis: It is not specified how data were analyzed. It is mentioned that graphs were elaborated, but it is not specified how results were interpreted.</p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>1,5 / 5</p>
<p>The results presented in this text are interesting, but they suffer from several limitations and weaknesses:</p> <p>1. _Lack of precision in presenting results_: The results are presented in a general manner, without specifying exact figures or percentages. This makes it difficult to interpret the results and understand their significance.</p> <p>2. _Lack of comparison with research objectives_: The results are not compared with the research objectives. This makes it difficult to determine if the achieved results correspond to the set objectives.</p> <p>3. _Lack of discussion on the implications of the results_: The results are not discussed in terms of implications for the studied communities or for public policies. This makes it difficult to understand the importance of the results and their potential impact.</p> <p>4. _Lack of consideration of methodological limitations_: The results do not take into account the limitations of the methodology used. This makes it difficult to determine if the results are reliable and generalizable.</p> <p>_Specific examples_:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The sentence "It was found that the studied communities have significant needs in terms of training and economic development" is too general and does not specify what these needs are exactly. - The sentence "The results showed that the studied communities have significant natural resources" does not specify what these resources are exactly and how they could be exploited. - The sentence "The results showed that the studied communities have significant needs in terms of tourist development" does not specify what these needs are exactly and how they could be met. 	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Discussion</p> <p>The discussion is too brief and does not allow for a thorough exploration of the study's results. It is mentioned that the results are in line with the work of Agüera (2015) and Agüera, F., & Morales, P. C. (2015), but it is not specified how these results are similar or different. Furthermore, the discussion does not take into account the study's limitations and the potential implications of the results. It is essential to discuss the results within the context of existing literature and interpret them critically.</p>	

Conclusion	
The conclusion is too general and does not accurately summarize the study's results. It is mentioned that community members need to better understand their community's resources, but it is not specified how this could be achieved. Furthermore, the conclusion does not provide concrete recommendations for policymakers or practitioners. It is essential to propose recommendations based on the study's results that can be implemented in practice.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3,5 / 5
the citation system employed seems to adhere to the relevant standards	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To improve the methodology, here are some proposals:

- 1. _Clearly define the research objective_:** It is essential to clearly define the research objective and specify what is being studied.
- 2. _Select a representative sample_:** It is essential to select a sample that is representative of the studied population. This can be done by using random selection methods or by selecting communities that are representative of the studied population.
- 3. _Validate the measurement instrument_:** It is essential to validate the measurement instrument before using it to collect data. This can be done by testing the instrument with a pilot group or by using statistical validation methods.
- 4. _Control variables_:** It is essential to control variables during data collection. This can be done by using methods to control variables or by selecting communities that are similar in terms of external variables.
- 5. _Analyze data clearly_:** It is essential to analyze data clearly and specify how results were interpreted. This can be done by using statistical analysis methods or by presenting results clearly and concisely."

Proposals for improving the text To improve the text, I propose:

- Expanding the discussion to explore the study's results more thoroughly.
- Taking into account the study's limitations and the potential implications of the results.

-
- Providing concrete recommendations for policymakers or practitioners.
 - Summarizing the study's results clearly and concisely in the conclusion.
 - Using more precise and technical language to describe the study's results."

Proposals for improving the presentation of results:

To improve the presentation of results, here are some proposals:

- 1. Present results in a more precise manner:** Results should be presented in a more precise manner, including exact figures and percentages.
- 2. Compare results with research objectives:** Results should be compared with research objectives to determine if the achieved results correspond to the set objectives.
- 3. Discuss the implications of the results:** Results should be discussed in terms of implications for the studied communities or for public policies.
- 4. Take into account methodological limitations:** Results should take into account the limitations of the methodology used to determine if the results are reliable and generalizable."

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: