

Paper: “The Violation of Human Rights in Latin America Derived from the Covid-19 Pandemic Administration”

Submitted: 04 December 2021

Accepted: 12 May 2022

Published: 31 May 2022

Corresponding Author: Ricardo Furfaro

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n16p21](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n16p21)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Arlinda Ymeraj
European University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2. Rasool Buksh Mirjat
Senior Civil Judge, Islamabad, Pakistan

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Arlinda Ymeraj	
University/Country: European University of Tirana, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 24 January 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 08 February 2022
Manuscript Title: IMPACT OF THE FIGHT AGAINST THE COVID -19 PANDEMIC ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN LATIN AMERICA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 58.12.2021	
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.	3

The title is somehow clear. However, I think it has to be more concise and more focused on the violation of HR due to pandemic.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results.	2
The abstract does not clearly mention scope of the research, objectives, methods, and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are very few errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The study methods are explained clearly, but there is no clear explanation how the methodology is utilized.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The results are clear, but not strongly connected to the implementation of the methodology.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
Very weak correlation between conclusions and findings.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are appropriate	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

While comments are inserted in the text with track change, the main concerns are listed below:

1. Abstract has to clearly mention the scope of the research, the purpose, the objectives, the methodology as well as the key findings.
2. Methodology has to be separated from findings-data analysis
3. There is no clear description of primary data, which are utilized to support the main thesis of the research.
4. There is no clear correlation between pandemic and the violation of HR.

5. there are too many issues addressed in the article, while the sources of information do not support all of them.
6. Findings do not seem to stem from the utilization of methodology, designed for the research.
7. No clarities on the research instruments and how they are utilized.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Dr.Rasool Buksh Mirjat	
University/Country: Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 14.03.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 22.03.2022
Manuscript Title: The Violation of Human Rights in Latam America Derived From the COVID-19 Pandemic Administration	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 02	
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 quite clear and sufficiently meet with the contents of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Agreed the abstract clearly reveals objects, methods and results</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are few grammatical errors of punctuations etc have depicted in the manuscript e.g overwhelming instead overwhelmingly written in the first par of Abstract, similarly started second para with Unreasonab instead of unreasonably. As well as other minor grammatical mistakes found in the main body of the paper which ought to be removed.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Apparently there is no confusion divulged in the method applied and explained.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Prima facie the results are not at variance. However, the questioner has not been shared in order to compare the results as explained.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion was very brief and short. It ought to be little bit elaborated with future recommendations.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>In fact sufficient number of references have been cited in support of content and discussion.</i>	

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):

Though the author has made a good effort and hard work in the manuscript. However, he should have explained how the pandemic can be delated besides ensuring human rights as all the measures being taken the analogy of right to life and to minimize death ratio. The paper also lacks the reason as to how the pandemic emergency was the same as of undemocratic emergency? Moreover, though education has been affected during the days of pandemic, however, the author has not realized the unveiling of modern techniques of imparting education

which otherwise would have taken years to implement. Apparently, the author's stance was found against the pandemic emergency and violation of basic human rights during that time. However, he admitted in para 3 on page 15 by appreciating the priority of the State regarding the purchase of protective gears, testing kits, and medicines as a good step, which indeed necessary saving lives of millions of people. Whereas, there is no specific case cited being lodged against state officials for alleged corruption. The paper also lacks regarding discrimination (if any) against any specific class of the society during the days of the pandemic as the same was in all and sundry.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: