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Opinion - The article is indicated as approved, with mandatory changes, in addition, it is strongly encouraged that authors accept proposed suggestions for a better final product, which is more complete and in accordance with the scope and quality of the journal.

The article is well developed and worked on, but there are points in the text that need to be clarified, related to the translation/writing and also some references have changes that need to be made.

NOTE: All mandatory changes pointed out in the review will be highlighted in the text (both in these notes and in the text with comments) in bold, underlined, red, these need to be made for the text to be approved.

WARNING: ALL CHANGES THAT ARE MADE TO THE TEXT, PLEASE BE MADE IN RED FOR IDENTIFICATION.

Methodology: The methodology section could be better worked on, including a greater connection between the methodology and the text, such as the reason for choosing the methodology in question and how it can be used to achieve the proposed objective in the work. It is also important in scientific works that the authors used as a basis for the selected methodologies are mentioned, if there is no specific work used as a basis, some exponent on the subject that is known to the authors of the article can be cited, but it is always advisable that all methods mentioned and used are accompanied by their theoretical references.

Translation and comprehension: There are words in the text that are repeated unnecessarily and in sequence, which may indicate problems in the translation and may lead to a loss of meaning, a review of these excerpts (they were marked in the text) is advisable. A general revision of the writing can also be useful in order to refine the text, avoid excessive repetition of words in the same paragraph and some punctuation and grammar problems.

References: There are errors that need to be modified in the references, references with authors that were not cited in full and references that do not appear in the text, all of which were highlighted in the comments sent in the text.

I am in favor of publication with the mandatory corrections!