
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 3/10/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 7/10/2017
Manuscript Title: La gestión urbana ambiental en América Latina, 1970 - 2017	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> El Título es claro y adecuado	5
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> El resumen es apropiado	5
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Tiene muy pocos errors gramaticales	5

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> La metodología es clara	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> La escritura es clara	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Las conclusiones son adecuadas	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Las referencias son adecuadas	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

El trabajo es muy bueno, refleja con claridad los problemas devenidos en América Latina debido al desarrollo capitalista y su función como “periferia” de este sistema. Los “vacíos” de conocimiento obedecen a la misma lógica del sistema ya que en sus inicios necesitó de la complicidad de las élites nativas. Posteriormente, como refleja el trabajo estamos en presencia de una toma de conciencia aunque queda mucho por hacer. Si bien los gobiernos Latinos han desarrollado secretarías y ministerios “ambientales” (por ejemplo Argentina tiene un Ministerio de Ambiente sin embargo la cuenca del Río de la Plata está completamente contaminada habiéndose desarrollado varios planes para su recuperación). Pese a ello su primer encargada (Ingeniera Alsogaray) terminó detenida por malversación de fondos y el Río de la Plata sigue igual pese a que la Corte Suprema de la Nación ordenó en 2005 su limpieza. Que decir de los cultivos de soja transgénica que abundan actualmente en la zona Sur de América Latina y sus fumigaciones de agrotóxicos sobre poblaciones cercanas a los campos.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

