

ACI Review form

Review form *ACI Avances en Ciencias e Ingenierías*

Thanks for your kind collaboration as reviewer of this publication. To submit your review, you must follow three simple steps:

1. Answer the specific questions about the manuscript on this form (the mandatory fields are marked with an asterisk*).
2. You can add comments directly on the manuscript file (using the track changes option in Word or comments in Adobe) and uploading the new version to the journal's web platform.
3. Indicate your final recommendation about the manuscript on the journal's web platform.

You can review the [Authors Guidelines clicking here](#).

We appreciate that you send your comments and suggestions within the maximum time established for the review.

1. Is the manuscript topic within the focus and scope of the journal? [More info about the focus and scope, here.](#)*

*

- Yes
- Partially
- No

Comments about the adjustment of the manuscript to the focus and scope of the journal.

2. Is the title clear and concise, does it reflect the content and relevance of the manuscript, will it differentiate it from other publications on the same topic, and does it capture the reader's attention?*

*

- Yes
- Partially
- No

Comments and suggestions about the title (especially if you marked No or Partially):

3. Does the abstract reflect appropriately the content of the manuscript, defining the topic, explaining why the research was conducted, what were the objectives, how were these objectives met, and what are the main results and conclusions?

*

- Yes
- Partially
- No

Comments and suggestions about the abstract (especially if you marked No or Partially):

4. What is the writing level (style, grammar and spelling)? *

- The writing is correct, the language is well used, with sophisticated style, correct grammar and spelling.
- The writing is acceptable, but there is a possible to improvement in style, or there is minor grammar mistakes, and spelling errors.
- The writing requires a general review, it may be due to the use of language, or the need for grammatical or spelling corrections.
- The writing is unacceptable, requires extensive copyediting, and suffers from many grammatical or spelling errors.

Comments and suggestions on writing:

5. Is the study topic or research question clearly defined? *

- Yes, the topic/question is clearly defined.
- No, the topic/question is not clearly defined.

6. Was the research done with appropriate methodologies, and is there enough information to reproduce the research?

*

In the case of manuscripts that talk about species this question includes the species voucher deposited in open access collections, or the audiovisual material of background.

- Yes, the methodologies are appropriate, and there is enough information to reproduce the research.
- The methodologies are partially appropriate, or there is not enough information to reproduce the research.
- No, the methodologies are inappropriate, and there is not enough information to reproduce the research.

Commentaries and suggestions about the methodology:

7. Do you consider that the results are presented in a clear, organized, accurate way, and described comprehensively?

*

- Yes
- Partially
- No

Comments and suggestions about the results:

8. Do you consider the discussion is complete, relevant, and critical, putting the results into a perspective of a broad scientific context?

*

- Yes
- Partially
- No

Comments and suggestions about the discussion:

9. Is each table and figure (as applicable) useful, with relevant data, and well organized? *

- Yes
- Partially
- No

Comments and suggestions about the tables and figures (both its format and its content): *

10. Is the cited literature appropriate, up-to-dated and relevant? *

- Yes
- Partially
- No

Comments and suggestions about the cited literature:

Additional comments and suggestions to be sent to the author: *

Comments addressed only to the editor of this manuscript: