

**Paper: “La Salud en la Medicina Complementaria, Viejas Definiciones para Nuevos Agentes Sociales”**

**Submitted: 22 September 2022**

**Accepted: 23 December 2022**

**Published: 31 December 2022**

Corresponding Author: Maria Antonia Ramirez Perez

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n38p21](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n38p21)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jesus Emmanuel Corres Gonzalez  
Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro, México

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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: LE. Corres González Jesús Emmanuel	
University/Country: Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro, México	
Date Manuscript Received: 01/12/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/12/2022
Manuscript Title: LA SALUD EN LA MEDICINA COMPLEMENTARIA, VIEJAS DEFINICIONES PARA NUEVOS AGENTES SOCIALES. LOS CASOS DE CIUDAD DE MÉXICO Y SEVILLA	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

	<i>Rating Result</i>
<i>Questions</i>	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Yes, excellent.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>I recommend you to place the words introduction: and then the content, etc.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The grammar is fine.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Change this type of words this is in the second paragraph "Se parte <b>pués</b>, de un concepto de salud que", be more formal.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>In the results in table 2 the table is not so clear the professionals-public box is empty</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>In the discussion relate at least 2 studies that have been done in another country or in another year.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>No, the references it should be done in APA format, for example at the end of the paragraph (González, 2022) and remove the numbers in some paragraphs</i>	

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

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

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

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

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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!*

Date Manuscript Received: October 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2022.	Date Review Report Submitted: October 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2022.
Manuscript Title: LA SALUD EN LA MEDICINA COMPLEMENTARIA, VIEJAS DEFINICIONES PARA NUEVOS AGENTES SOCIALES.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1034/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each 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>Se sugiere incluir la comparación del concepto salud en la medicina complementaria entre distintos contextos culturales.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>Incluir la descripción de la metodología y características de la población de estudio.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Sería conveniente realizar una descripción mas clara de las categorías y las subcategorías que comprende. En algunos casos, el texto omite la descripción de subcategorías, por ej., abandono y entrega. El manuscrito contiene faltas de redacción, ej., conciencia vs consciencia; así como falta de descripción de las figuras, ej., significado de los tipos de flechas.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Los métodos describen la aplicación de entrevistas, sin embargo no se indica como estaban estructuradas y en que referencia se basaron para su análisis. No es claro que diseño muestral se aplico (A o B) y que resultados se obtuvieron por tipo de diseño. Asimismo, sería interesante comparar los discursos por pares, esto es, comparar los discursos de especialistas que pertenezcan a la misma área de interés, de España y México.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>De forma general, los resultados se encuentran bien descritos, aunque sería interesante puntualizar en aquellos aspectos en los que difirieron los especialistas de ambos países.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>El manuscrito carece de una sección de conclusiones, éstas se describen en la sección de discusión.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Las referencias son adecuadas al texto presentado, sin embargo, sería conveniente actualizar/incluir referencias de la última década.</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Incluir evidencia científica sobre la influencia cultural en el concepto de salud, ya que esto es un aspecto relevante para la investigación presentada.

Ampliar la descripción de la metodología empleada y analizar los datos por pares.

Revisar la edición y redacción de las figuras ya que contienen varios errores de redacción.

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

Es una investigación interesante que presenta el concepto de salud en medicina complementaria y si este se encuentra influido por la geografía. Considero que requiere ajustes menores para ser aceptado.