

---

# 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: 18/11/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>METODOLOGÍA PARA LA CARACTERIZACIÓN ECOLÓGICA DE BOFEDALES, HÁBITAT DE LAS VICUÑAS CON LA UTILIZACION DE TELEDETECCION Y SIG  ESTUDIO DE CASO: RESERVA DE PRODUCCIÓN DE FAUNA CHIMBORAZO</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: d10.Paulina Beatriz Díaz Moyota	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The objective or purpose of this research is not clearly determined The methodology is well explained It is suggested to improve the summary, increasing the part of methods and the results to increase another result that potentiates the summary.	

The results remain weak without explaining the actual conclusion (methodology)	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> It is necessary to elaborate an outline of the methods and orderly chain that was applied as part of the methodology used for the development of the research.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> It is clear however in the introduction it is necessary to incorporate bibliographical references of similar works, to incorporate the hypothesis. It is necessary to increase the discussion strengthened with bibliographical references.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Habría que revisar la primera conclusión pues en el procesamiento se enmarca mucho que las imágenes no estuvieron acorde a los estándares para realizar la investigación y que se tuvo inconvenientes...y al final mencionan que permite precisión??.. o a su vez sustentar mejor la conclusión 2.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> In the section bibliographical references there is no correspondence between the references used from the reference number 12 onwards since it is not evident in the document.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

## **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

It is important to consider rethinking the title, to strengthen the abstract, to improve the introduction considering the application of similar works, to draw up a diagram of the whole process, to increase the discussion, to include references and to consider bibliographic references only of those that are used.

Consider also:

There is a lot of confusion in the use of images, they are analyzed separately but it would have been better to do an integration of images if they are from the same year or instead a lidar image, to be able to obtain height or slopes or degree of insolation, or appearance, with In order to obtain more clarity in the study.

Another situation that is to consider the rectified orthophotos, which lose their characteristic of spectral resolution or spatial resolution. I am not very clear about the studies conducted in depth but are the suggestions that I can issue with the revised

## **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Consider the suggested suggestions regarding the summary, introduction, formulation of a hypothesis, the outline of a methodology used in the methods, results, increase the discussion fostered by other references and the bibliographical references used must match between those used and Which are reflected in the same section.

