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Opinion - The article is indicated as approved, with mandatory changes, in addition, it is strongly encouraged that authors accept proposed suggestions for a better final product, which is more complete and in accordance with the scope and quality of the journal.

The article is well developed and worked on, but there are some reference errors that need to be corrected, also the conclusion leaves something to be desired in relation to what is worked throughout the article.

NOTE: All mandatory changes pointed out in the review will be highlighted in the text (both in these notes and in the text with comments) in bold, underlined, red, these need to be made for the text to be approved.

WARNING: ALL CHANGES THAT ARE MADE TO THE TEXT, PLEASE BE MADE IN RED FOR IDENTIFICATION.

Translation and comprehension: An English review is recommended, there were words left over, sentences with errors that made reading difficult, among others.

Conclusion: Suggestion - The article is well-crafted and with good development of the theme of gamification and innovation, addressing several relevant characteristics of both the digitization process and its relationship with innovation and gamification, as well as confrontations with traditionalism, but none of this is clearly reflected in the conclusion, the conclusion being presented as a very direct and simple response to the research proposal, it would be interesting to add more content in the conclusion, especially the authors' voice, showing the corrections that the authors made and how these correlations, especially the possible synergies and clashes between innovation and traditionalism affect or may affect the teaching processes worked.

References: There are errors that need to be modified in the references, references that were not used in the text appear in the final list, all were highlighted in the comments sent in the text.

I am in favor of publication with the mandatory corrections!