

PARECER A

Como referenciar este artigo:

PIRANI, S.; NADERI, M. Explorando os fatores que afetam a educação política no Irã. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 28, n. 00, e023012, 2024. e-ISSN: 1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v28i00.19059>



| **Submetido em:** 22/02/2024
| **Revisões requeridas em:** 19/03/2024
| **Aprovado em:** 17/04/2024
| **Publicado em:** 09/05/2024

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes
Editor Adjunto Executivo: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

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?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
2. Is the topic important to the context in which it is inserted?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
3. Does the introduction make the research topic clear, present the studies that have addressed the problem or similar research and point out the gap that the research covers/justification for the research?
(C) Yes () Partially () No
4. Does the introduction make it clear what the research question is or the hypotheses (if applicable) and are the general and/or specific objectives in line with the research question?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set?
(X) Yes () Partially () 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?
(X) Yes () Partially () 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?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
8. Are the results consistent with the aim of the research, the theoretical framework and the methodology?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
9. Is the data calculated correctly and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
13. Do the conclusions present authorial closure without repeating previous parts of the article and pointing out the limitations of the research itself and future research?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
Reviewer'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 the subtitle (if there is one) is 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.
(X) Yes () Partially () No
2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
4. Is the objective clearly written?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explain how data will be collected (if applicable) and analyzed?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
6. Is the methodology coherent with the theory and consistent with the results?
(X) Yes () Partially () No
7. If the research involves human beings, have the procedures carried out to comply with research ethics guidelines been described or the approval number of the work by the research ethics committee indicated?
() Yes () Partially () No
Reviewer's comments on the methodological dimension.
-
C. AESTHETIC DIMENSION
Writing, form and normalization.
1. Are the rules observed with regard to citations (ABNT 10520 - 2023), references (ABNT 6023 - 2018), presentation of illustrations and tables (title and source)?
() Yes () Partially (X) No
2. Does the text show 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 (X) Partially () No
3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of adequate size and legibility for reading?
() Yes () Partially () No
Reviewer's comments on the aesthetic dimension
- There are a few minor typos, such as verb and tense agreement. There are also some missing connective words, conjunctions and prepositions. A review of English language writing is recommended
Recommendation
() Accept
(X) Accept with mandatory corrections

- Submit again for evaluation
- Submit to another journal
- Reject

Reviewer's opinion/ Comments

- The text is very well developed, working well with the proposal made and the analysis developed, the exposition of the theme proves to be of great value for international comparative studies and for a better understanding of education systems and influences in different educational systems. The file sent was protected against editing, so it was not possible to send specific comments on the original text.

List of mandatory corrections

- Reference to Pacho, 2014 does not exist, citation of this author exists on page 2. All cited authors must have their corresponding references.
- Reference to Wringe 2021 does not exist, citation to this author on page 3. All cited authors need to have their references matched.
- Reference to Almond 1990 and 2000 does not exist, citation to this author on page 8. All cited authors need to have their references matched.