Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

| **statements** | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written and structured. It is smooth to read. The experiment described is well designed. The results are displayed and discussed. The contribution of the article represents an advance in the area of knowledge. However, I suggest the following two improvements: a) The state of the art of the problem dealt with should be expanded in the introduction. b) The conclusions should be improved by synthetically indicating what the scientific contribution is and proposing a set of lines of work.