



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Cuantificación de metales pesados del sargazo que arriba a las costas del estado de Quintana Roo”

Submitted: 08 May 2026

Accepted: 28 September 2026

Published: 30 September 2026

Corresponding Author: Alberto Pereira Corona

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n27p120

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Daniel Federico Morla
National University of Rio Cuarto, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Rosendo Romero Andrade
Autonomous University of Sinaloa, Mexico

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: 06/11/26	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/13/26
Manuscript Title: Caracterización y Análisis de Metales Pesados para el Adecuado Manejo del Sargazo que Arriba a las Costas del Estado de Quintana Roo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0544/26	
You agree that 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 for the content of the article.	5
The Tittle is clear.	

2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	2
Yes, it is understandable; however, it should be reviewed by a native English speaker to improve its readability, as the quality of the English throughout the manuscript is not adequate.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The manuscript is written in Spanish and does not contain many spelling errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
The methods are not described in sufficient detail. Please refer to the comments provided at the end of the document.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
The results are not described in sufficient detail. Please refer to the comments provided at the end of the document.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusions need to be revised. Please refer to the comments provided in the attached document.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>It need to be improved with more actual references, also the doi is missed.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Authors,

I have read your manuscript with interest and find the topic relevant; however, there are several aspects that need to be clarified before the manuscript can be considered for publication. My comments are listed below.

Minor Comments

1. The figures are of low quality. It is recommended to significantly improve their resolution to facilitate the interpretation of the results.
2. The figures appear to be incorrectly numbered. Please carefully review the figure numbering and all corresponding references within the text.
3. The abstract is confusing in some sections and makes it difficult to clearly understand the main findings of the study. It is recommended that it be reviewed by an expert in scientific writing or by a native English speaker.
4. Please include the DOI for all references whenever available. Currently, many citations do not provide this information.
5. Several references are not formatted consistently. Please review and standardize the reference format throughout the manuscript.
6. Tables should not be presented as images. It is recommended that they be included in an editable tabular format following the journal's guidelines.

Major Comments

7. The literature review is relatively limited considering the topic addressed. It is recommended to expand the state of the art by incorporating recent and relevant studies related to heavy metal accumulation in *Sargassum spp.*, as well as research concerning its management and potential utilization.
8. I am concerned about the statements regarding differences among species, sampling campaigns, and metal concentrations. In particular, terms such as “significant” are used throughout the manuscript without presenting statistical analyses to support these claims. How can these conclusions be adequately justified? Please clearly specify the statistical analyses performed and provide the corresponding results.
9. Regarding the sampling campaigns, why were only five campaigns conducted? Are they sufficient to support the conclusions presented? Furthermore, the manuscript should provide more detailed information regarding the sampling dates, duration of each campaign, and the environmental conditions during the sampling period, as this information is essential for a proper interpretation of the results.
10. The sampling methodology requires further clarification. The manuscript states that aliquots from a composite sample were considered replicates; however, these may not represent statistically independent replicates. The authors should justify this approach and clearly explain what experimental unit was used in the analyses.
11. The conclusions do not appear to be fully supported by the results presented. In several cases, explanations and recommendations for future studies are provided without sufficient evidence from the current work to support such interpretations. I recommend restructuring the conclusions section and limiting it to statements that are directly supported by the results obtained. I believe this is a topic of considerable current relevance; however, several methodological, statistical, and interpretative aspects require substantial clarification and improvement before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Partially. The title is generally consistent with the manuscript content; however, it could be shortened and better aligned with the actual scope of the study. A suggested alternative title has been provided in the manuscript comments.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Partially. The abstract summarizes the main findings of the study; however, the objectives are not clearly stated, methodological information is limited, and the conclusions include management recommendations that are not fully supported by the data presented.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

A few grammatical, spelling, and style issues were identified. Specific corrections and suggestions have been provided directly in the manuscript.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Partially. The methodology is generally described in sufficient detail to understand the sampling, processing, and analytical procedures. However, some aspects require clarification, particularly the sampling design, the definition of replicates and subsamples, quality control procedures, and the statistical analysis of the data. Addressing these issues would improve the clarity and reproducibility of the manuscript.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are generally understandable and well organized; however, some interpretations appear to be based on descriptive comparisons rather than formal statistical analyses. In addition, the Results and Discussion sections are not always clearly separated, making it difficult to distinguish between observed findings and their interpretation. Simplifying some tables and clearly separating results from discussion would improve the clarity of the manuscript.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are generally consistent with the results obtained; however, some statements and management recommendations extend beyond the evidence directly generated by the study. The conclusions would be strengthened by focusing on the findings supported by the data and clearly distinguishing them from recommendations for future research.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are generally relevant and appropriate for the topic of the study. However, some inconsistencies in citation style were noted, and additional references could strengthen the discussion of heavy metal sources, accumulation processes, and risk implications.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

El manuscrito aborda una problemática ambiental relevante y de gran actualidad. La información generada sobre el contenido de metales pesados en *Sargassum* spp. resulta valiosa y potencialmente útil para futuras investigaciones y para la toma de decisiones relacionadas con el manejo de estas arribazones.

No obstante, considero que el manuscrito puede fortalecerse con algunas revisiones. En particular, sugiero revisar el título para que refleje con mayor precisión el alcance real del estudio, mejorar la estructura y contenido del resumen, aclarar algunos aspectos metodológicos relacionados con el diseño de muestreo, la definición de réplicas y los procedimientos de control de calidad analítica, y separar más claramente las secciones de Resultados y Discusión (o en defecto unirlos).

También, algunas conclusiones y recomendaciones de manejo exceden la evidencia generada por los datos presentados, por lo que sería conveniente delimitar con mayor precisión el alcance de las inferencias realizadas. Finalmente, se recomienda revisar aspectos de redacción, nomenclatura científica, formato de citación y presentación de tablas y figuras para mejorar la claridad general del manuscrito.

Creo que atender estas observaciones contribuirá a mejorar la calidad, claridad y solidez científica del trabajo.