

EVALUATION FORM

Article ID:

A. COGNITIVE DIMENSION
Sequential and logical sequencing of the content of scientific ideas.
1. Does the article contain original ideas that have not yet been presented on the subject?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is the topic important for its context?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the introduction make the topic of the research clear, present the studies that have addressed the problem or similar research, and point out the gap that the research covers/justification of the research?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the introduction clarify the research question or the hypotheses (if applicable), and are the general and/or specific objectives in line with the research question?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Is the theoretical framework presented in sufficient quantity and quality for the research construct, and are the ideas presented in sufficient depth for the study in question?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. Does the theoretical framework presented include classic authors in the field who are still relevant to the discussion, and does it also include work from the last five years?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Are the results consistent with the research objective, the theoretical framework, and the methodology?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
9. Is the data calculated correctly, and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No

EVALUATION FORM

10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
13. Do the conclusions present authorial closure without repeating previous parts of the article and pointing out limitations of the research itself and future research?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
Evaluator's comments on the cognitive dimension.
B. METHODOLOGICAL DIMENSION
Precise description of the methods and techniques used.
1. Does the title specify the content of the work more generally, and is the subtitle (if there is one) a technical title more related to the topic? Another possible approach is when the title refers to the theoretical object and the subtitle to the empirical object.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Is the objective clearly written?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explain how data will be collected (if applicable) and analyzed?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Is the methodology coherent with the theory and consistent with the results?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. If the research involves human beings, have the procedures carried out to comply with research ethics guidelines been described, or has the work been approved by a research ethics committee?

EVALUATION FORM

Yes Partially No

Evaluator's comments on the methodological dimension.

C. AESTHETIC DIMENSION

Writing, form, and standardization.

1. Do you comply with the rules regarding citations (ABNT 10520 - 2023), references (ABNT 6023 - 2018), presentation of illustrations and tables (title and source)?

Yes Partially No

2. Does the text have correct accentuation and typing of words; nominal and verbal agreement; correct arrangement of words and connection between sentences or paragraphs (cohesion); logical relationship of the ideas presented (coherence); avoid repetition in the text of what is already written in the illustrations and tables?

Yes Partially No

3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of adequate size and legibility for reading?

Yes Partially No

Evaluator's comments on the aesthetic dimension

Recommendation

- Accept
 Accept with mandatory corrections
 Resubmit for evaluation
 Submit to another journal
 Reject

Evaluator's opinion/ Comments

List of mandatory corrections

If the recommendation was "accept with mandatory corrections", fill in the list of actions that the authors should take. We ask for your cooperation so that the items are written in such a way that the authors are clear about what they have to do. Fill in one item per topic.

Examples:

- Check ABNT standards.
- Include references from the last 5 years.