EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute ESI
10 YEARS

Paper: **"La epidemia de peste a fines del siglo XVI: un análisis comparativo de los Imperios Otomano y Español"**

Submitted: 22 April 2022
Accepted: 01 June 2022
Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Omur Yanar

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p227

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jesus Gerardo Martínez del Castillo
University of Almeria, Spain

Reviewer 2: Amaya Epelde Larranaga
University of Granada, Spain

Reviewer 3: Francisco Javier Mejía-Ochoa
Investigador del Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Zongolica, México

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, it does.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, I agree.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are no errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, it is explained clearly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of paper is clear and it does not contan any errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes, it does.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, they are.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is an orginal study. I think that it would contribute the field.

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear and adequate to the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, it does.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No grammatical errors unless the expression "esta área" instead of "este área" but the plural is correct "estas áreas".

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, the study methods are explained clearly. They give a detailed information of the facts describing the state of affairs.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes, it does not contain errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is accurate and supported by the contents

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Although it is not in direct connection with the topic dealt with in the article, I would recomend the following book:

Kyle Harper. El fatal destino de Roma: Cambio climático y enfermedad en el fin de un imperio. Crítica.

The pandemic described in the article could be put in connection with the pandemic described by Harper in the Middle Ages.

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

El título es claro, sin embargo considero que no refleja el contenido del artículo.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

El método únicamente es enunciado, sin exponer detalles acerca del procedimiento ni estrategia de análisis.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

El método no es expuesto con amplitud. Se enuncia el método histórico comparativo, pero no se explica una estrategia de análisis o detalles procedimentales. Ello se hace evidente en los resultados expuestos.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

El texto tiene una estructura clara, con pocos errores gramaticales o de sintaxis.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

La conclusión refleja un análisis poco exhaustivo de información. Se sugiere una comparación, con fines de explicación, sin embargo el trabajo se limita a exponer la

peste en dos regiones distintas de manera independiente sin establecer con claridad los puntos de comparación, semejanza o diferenciación. En uno (imperio otomano) tiene una connotación geográfica mientras que en el otro (imperio español) tiene un abordaje demográfico.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

El citado es conveniente. Se abusa de notas al pie.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Estimados autores.

El trabajo es sumamente interesante y aborda un problema que, desde una perspectiva histórica, es sumamente actual. Sin embargo, considero que no se atiende a cabalidad el sentido de la estrategia metodológica planteada. Se trata de un estudio histórico comparativo, sin embargo se carecen de paralelismos, proximidades y distancias que permitan hacer tal comparación, mas allá del periodo de tiempo en el que ocurren. Por otra parte, la exposición del problema se realiza, a mi parecer, desde dos perspectivas distintas, por una parte con un claro abordaje geográfico acerca de la expansión de la peste en el imperio otomano y, por otra parte, acerca de implicaciones demográficas de la misma, en este caso del imperio español. En suma, les exhortaría a hallar la manera de ser mas generosos con los argumentos que permitan explicar el contexto histórico de la peste en dos regiones del mundo con semejanzas y diferencias notables.

Respetuosamente.

Reviewer H:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and adequate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

It is an article about the history. It is not a research. It is a literature review. It presents goals and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are many grammatical errors. It is necessary to review the document.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

It is not a research. There is not a methodology.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is correct because it is a literature review but there are mistakes. Authors should not write what is already said through tables.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Information should not be repeated in the conclusions. Conclusions need to be rewritten.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references do not follow the APA Regulations.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See attached document.

Reviewer J:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear and relevant to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The ABSTRACT presents objects, methods and results implicitly.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are no grammatical and spelling errors in the article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study METHODS are explained implicitly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the article is clear and does not contain errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The CONCLUSION is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

REFERENCES are complete and adequate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This article is interesting, well written and has the elements to be published.
