Submission 1121. Peer-review process

Reviewer A
Round 1

1. Does the paper comply with the scientific quality standards of its field?*

⦿ Yes

○ No

2. Are the methods described in detail, so that the experiments are reproducible?*

⦿ Yes

○ No

3. Is the statistical analysis of the data appropriate and technically sound?*

⦿ Yes

○ No

3.1 If necessary, please, provide a brief explanation of your evaluation of the statistical methods used in the manuscript.

4. Are the claims/statements/conclusions fully supported by results?*

○ Yes

○ No

○ Partially

4.1 If not, please, indicate the additional evidence that would help accomplishing this requirement.

5. Are the claims/statements discussed rigorously, in the context of previous scientific literature and knowledge of the field? *

⦿ Yes

○ No

6. If your recommended decision is to reject the manuscript in its actual version, is the study promising enough as to encourage the authors to re-submit after a major revision?*

⦿ Yes

○ No

7. Is there any ethical concern related to experimental subjects (i. e. animals, humans)?*

○ Yes

○ No

8. Is there any evidence of manipulation of figures or images that compromise the scientific quality or reliability of the paper?*

○ Yes

○ No

9. Is the paper clearly written, following standard scientific English?*

◉ Yes

○ No

10. Have the authors made all experimental data fully available to readers?
This requirement can be accomplished through either supplementary files or by depositing data on public repositories.*

◉ Yes

○ No

11. Based on paper content and your global appraisal of it, indicate the type of publication that best fits the manuscript.

○ Original research article

○ Short communication

○ Review

12. I agree to review the updated version of the manuscript.*

◉ Yes

○ No

13. Comments to the editor. Please, include a brief report stating your general appraisal of the paper. Provide the reasons that support your recommended decision of acceptance, rejection or downgrading the paper to a research note.

14. Comments to authors (optional). Please, provide a constructive and thorough review of the sections. So, that the authors are able to prepare a revision ready for acceptance without incurring in multiple revision rounds.

Completed: 2022-10-17 09:43 AM
Reviewer Recommendation: Accept Submission

Reviewer B
Round 1

1. Does the paper comply with the scientific quality standards of its field?*

◉ Yes

○ No

2. Are the methods described in detail, so that the experiments are reproducible?*

◉ Yes

○ No

3. Is the statistical analysis of the data appropriate and technically sound?*

◉ Yes

○ No

3.1 If necessary, please, provide a brief explanation of your evaluation of the statistical methods used in the manuscript.

4. Are the claims/statements/conclusions fully supported by results?*

○ Yes

◉ No

○ Partially

4.1 If not, please, indicate the additional evidence that would help accomplishing this requirement.

5. Are the claims/statements discussed rigorously, in the context of previous scientific literature and knowledge of the field? *

◉ Yes

○ No

6. If your recommended decision is to reject the manuscript in its actual version, is the study promising enough as to encourage the authors to re-submit after a major revision?*

◉ Yes

○ No

7. Is there any ethical concern related to experimental subjects (i. e. animals, humans)?*

○ Yes

◉ No

8. Is there any evidence of manipulation of figures or images that compromise the scientific quality or reliability of the paper?*

○ Yes

◉ No

9. Is the paper clearly written, following standard scientific English?*

◉ Yes

○ No

10. Have the authors made all experimental data fully available to readers?
This requirement can be accomplished through either supplementary files or by depositing data on public repositories.*

◉ Yes

○ No

11. Based on paper content and your global appraisal of it, indicate the type of publication that best fits the manuscript.

○ Original research article

○ Short communication

◉ Review

12. I agree to review the updated version of the manuscript.*

◉ Yes

○ No

13. Comments to the editor. Please, include a brief report stating your general appraisal of the paper. Provide the reasons that support your recommended decision of acceptance, rejection or downgrading the paper to a research note.

I don´t have comments to the editor.

14. Comments to authors (optional). Please, provide a constructive and thorough review of the sections. So, that the authors are able to prepare a revision ready for acceptance without incurring in multiple revision rounds.

I don´t have comments to the authors.

Section Editor Recommendation

Enrique Jesús Delgado Suárez, Miguel Cuevas Díaz:

The recommendation regarding the submission to Veterinaria México OA, "A scoping review and systematic map of primary studies assessing heat stress on reproductive, physiological, and productive parameters of farm animals" is: Accept Submission

Dr. Hugo O. Toledo Alvarado
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
h.toledo.a@fmvz.unam.mx

Editor Decision: Accept Submission:

Daniel Diaz, Ana Maria Lopez-Orrantia, Asly Nicol Camacho, Rene Jose Rosiles, Miguel Angel Rodriguez-Gaxiola, Javier Alonso Romo-Rubio, Jesus Jose Portillo-Loera, Soila Maribel Gaxiola, Arnulfo Montero-Pardo:

Regarding your submission to Veterinaria México OA, "A scoping review and systematic map of primary studies assessing heat stress on reproductive, physiological, and productive parameters of farm animals", I am pleased to inform you that, based on reviewers recommendations, it has been accepted for publication.

The manuscript will enter now the copyediting stage (it may last several weeks). Journal staff will contact you in case of adjustments to the document are needed, as well as to seek your approval of the final proof.

Thank you for publishing your work in Veterinaria México OA. We hope to have further contributions from you in the near future.

Enrique Jesús Delgado Suárez
vetmexicooa@fmvz.unam.mx

Editor in Chief
Veterinaria México OA