

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating) Se incluyen las observaciones realizadas al escrito para que se efectúen entre ellas está el uso de sinónimos y el uso de comas, además de eliminar algunas palabras innecesarias.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating). El estudio se centra en la importancia del Diagnostico fitosanitario y lo expone a profundidad.</i>	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating). Es importante mejorar la redacción de la última conclusión.</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

El escrito maneja un tema muy importante para el diagnóstico correcto y las medidas convenientes para el control de enfermedades causadas por hongos, lo que resulta una valiosa contribución para la región hortícola del noroeste de México. No obstante es importante mejorar la redacción en cuanto al uso de sinónimos y comas, y eliminar algunas palabras para facilitar su lectura así como revisar dos párrafos importantes del objetivo y conclusiones que facilitan la comprensión del trabajo (se incluye el escrito con las observaciones en rojo)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Resulta un estudio que recopila bibliografía básica en el tema enfatiza la importancia del diagnóstico en la detección de enfermedades causadas por hongos. Resulta una guía importante para los técnicos, y productores del sector agropecuario en general y de la región noroeste de México en lo particular. Es importante se realicen las correcciones que se marcan en el escrito para su posible publicación.