



Paper: **“Demographic Gaps in Some Latin American Countries (1985-2020)”**

Corresponding Author: Giuseppina Sacco

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n22p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bupinder Zutshi
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi-India

Reviewer 2: Francesco D. d'Ovidio
University of Bari “Aldo Moro”, Italy

Reviewer 3: Bola L. Solanke
Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria

Reviewer 4: TOMA Ernesto,
Università Degli Studi di Bari Aldo Moro, Bari, Italy

Published: 31.08.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Professor Bupinder Zutshi	Email:
University/Country: Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi- India	
Date Manuscript Received: 16th June 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 19th June 2020
Manuscript Title: Demographic Gaps in Some Latin American Countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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>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.	4
<p>Yes the title broadly reflects the content of the research paper. My suggestion is that period of study should also be incorporated in the title. I would suggest the following title</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Demographic Gaps in Some Latin American Countries (1985-2020)</i></p>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<p><i>The researcher has not given Abstract in the paper, instead he is stating Premise, which is altogether different than Abstract. The research should write Abstract as is the normal practice required for publication in this journal.</i></p> <p>The abstract should provide informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found. Method and study's design should be also indicated briefly. The Abstract crisp and succinct, within 250 words. .</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p><i>Language used in the research paper is fine, but the researcher should not use the word "We have done etc" in the text. Instead researcher should use. The study adopted etc. as is the normal practice in research papers published in journals.</i></p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p>Methodology used should form separate section in the paper, highlighting the methods used at one place. Sources of information of data for the tables presented has not been given. Study's design and methodological approach were not explained properly. Perhaps a section should explain the design of study and methodology for clarity of the readers.</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<p>The objectives of this study were met. It should also examine the causes and consequences of such demographic situation.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<p><i>Yes, the conclusion are accurate and supporting the content</i></p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<p><i>The researcher has given bibliography instead of references, which is the normal practice for published research papers in journal.</i></p> <p>The author should provide the DOI or URL of each online source. Reference list should be reformatted according to the journal's referencing policy.</p> <p><i>As per APN format</i></p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper has good content useful for readers. But the researchers should incorporate the suggested changes.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper has good content useful for readers. But the researchers should incorporate the suggested changes before it can be accepted for publication.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Professor TOMA Ernesto	Email:
University/Country: Università degli studi di Bari Aldo Moro, Bari, Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 17.06.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 16.07.2020
Manuscript Title: Demographic gaps in some Latin American countries	
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>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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is clear and consistent with the article. Perhaps a reference to the period analyzed can be assumed	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

The abstract is absent, replaced by a “premise”. We recommend replacing the title with “abstract” adjusting his lenght	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are no grammatical errors and spelling mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> If the "premise" becomes "abstract", it would be appropriate to indicate the source of the data in the tables presented. The structure of the research is correctly explained.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The article is clear and free of errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, the Concluding remarks are accurate and supported by the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is recommended that you provide the DOI or URL of each online source	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is clear, interesting and methodologically correct

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: no particular comment

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Bola L. Solanke	Email:
University/Country: Obafemi Awolowo University/Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 17/06/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/06/2020
Manuscript Title: Demographic gaps in some Latin American countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 108.06.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(There is synergy between the title and the content of the article)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Replace premise with abstract. Reword propositional words/phrase such as ‘we will try’ ‘we will identify’ to past tenses)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Scanty)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Improve the citations by further engaging relevant literature

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper addressed an important population issue in Latin America

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Francesco D. d'Ovidio	Email:
University/Country: University of Bari "Aldo Moro" (Italy)	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 June 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 June 2020
Manuscript Title: Demographic Gaps in Some Latin American Countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
Yes, title is very adequate, as I see. Not too much generic, not too much limited.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
No abstract at all! Maybe the journal do not require it?	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p>I am not native English speaker, but I think the language used in this article is quite correct. Please avoid, if it is possible, personalized locutions, as “In this paper, we will try to...” instead of “<i>The research in this paper will try to...</i>”. This mode is adopted more often in scientific papers, but even classical Authors used first person locutions, sometimes</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p>Yes, the methodology is explained quite clearly. Maybe the study design needs more than a few rows in the Premise, and, for better clearness, all mathematical formulations should be collected in a sub-section before Table 1 and its description. It is very simple, cutting all the sentences starting by “The average annual rate of population variation can be considered as the result of the sum of the natural variation rate (v_n) and the migratory variation rate (v_m)”, up to the formula “$v_m=r-vn$”, and pasting them before the sentence “In <i>Table 1</i> we can read the data of the total population concerning the countries under observation and referring to 1985 and 2020, the population variation index numbers (placed in decreasing order), 1985 = 100 and the average annual rates of population variation.”</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<p>No further comment</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<p>No further comment. Of course, avoid “we”, if it is possible.</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<p>Quite good, but...</p> <p>The term “Bibliography” is less usual in scientific journals than “References” or “Bibliographic References”.</p> <p>Moreover, ONLY books and papers that Authors cited in their article should be reported in the <i>References</i> section, but ALL of them should be reported.</p> <p>Texts never cited (but I guess that the article contains at least some sentences recalling such book and papers: for example, U.N. 2009 could be cited in the first sentence of the Premise, that opens with a usual judgement of the World Population Prospects, as I remember):</p> <p>Golini, A. (2003), <i>La popolazione del pianeta</i>, Il Mulino.</p> <p>Golini, A. (a cura di), (2009), <i>Il futuro della popolazione del mondo</i>, Il Mulino.</p> <p>Livi Bacci, M., <i>Introduzione alla Demografia</i>, ultima edizione, Loescher Ed.</p> <p>Livi Bacci, M. (2002), <i>Storia minima della popolazione del mondo</i>, Il Mulino.</p>	

Myrskylä, M., Kohler H.P., Billari, F.C., (2009), *Advances in development reverse fertility declines*, *Nature* volume 460, pages 741–743.

Sacco, G., Sacco P. (2016). *The ageing scenario of the Italian Population (Vol.12, N.35)*. Publisher ESI, ISSN: 1857 - 7431 (Online), December, (pp. 1 -15).

Sanderson, W., Scherbov, S. (2007). *A new perspective on population aging*. *Demographic Research* 16, (pp. 27-58).

Società italiana di Statistica, (2007), *Rapporto sulla popolazione. L'Italia all'inizio del XXI secolo*, Il Mulino.

United Nations, *World Population Prospects. The 2008 Revision*, New York, 2009

Authors forgot, instead: Lis & Sambin (1977).

Furthermore, books require, usually, the town (and often the country) of the Publisher: for example “Il Mulino, Bologna (Italy)”; the paper published just online requires, instead, DOI or URL.

Last but not least, please standardize references:

- 1) the publication year must be reported ever in the same position (in this case, before the title),
- 2) the title of the U.N. 2009 (if it will be saved as I said) must be written in italic,
- 3) the page numbers must be written ever in the same way: I guess, as “pp. 741-743”, without parentheses.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is good and interesting, and the proposed corrections will improve its clearness.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No further comments