

Review of: "The World of Perception — Comparative Philosophy of the Ancient Mayan Bird Totems"

Sonia Tidemann

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments on: The World of Perception — Comparative Philosophy of the Ancient Mayan Bird Totems

General comments.

While the topic of the manuscript has potential for a very interesting intellectual development and discussion, much more work needs to be done on it. I started making suggestions but by time I reached page 9, I realised that it would not be very constructive to continue making suggestions until the paper was re-worked. It is almost impossible to follow the premise that has been established in the title. The images are presented as though it is a museum talk to tourists rather than a scholarly development of an idea. It seems as though the authors have not embraced the skill of comparative philosophy.

That all sounds very negative but I think the ideas are interesting. Unfortunately, the writing and development are insufficiently scholarly, at the moment, to be able to recommend it for publication.

1. Abstract – Philosophy extends beyond your list. Revisit opening sentence.
2. Introduction and throughout – Remove expressions such as 'I would like to expound on..', 'I believe..'.
3. P2 Check English spelling of Egyptian gods and other words, for example, 'figs'. I appreciate that you are working in a second or third language. Get someone for whom English is a first language to proof read your manuscript. Sentence structure needs to be revised as well as spelling. The text needs to be made more succinct and less like a chat.

The text is confusing because it is written in the first person despite the entry near the beginning that the paper was written jointly.

The way you suggest you're going to help 'scholars' sounds rather paternalistic

1. P2 and throughout – check your use of 'Maya' vs. 'Mayan' and apply consistently.
2. P3 and throughout – inadequate citing of references. The labels on the pictures are not legible.
3. 2.1 This clearly is not your writing. You need to indicate what has been quoted using quote marks.
4. P 9 What is the rib cage of a flower?