

## PARECER A

### Como referenciar este artigo:

ZANCANARO, M.; MATHIAS, T.; HAHN, I. S. O papel das instituições de ensino superior na promoção da inovação e empreendedorismo para o desenvolvimento regional. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 28, n. 00, e023027, 2024. e-ISSN: 1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v28i00.19742>



| **Submetido em:** 14/06/2024  
| **Revisões requeridas em:** 09/07/2024  
| **Aprovado em:** 16/08/2024  
| **Publicado em:** 11/10/2024

---

**Editor:** Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes

**Editor Adjunto Executivo:** Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

<b>A. COGNITIVE DIMENSION</b>
<b>Sequential and logical sequencing of the content of scientific ideas.</b>
<b>1. Does the article contain original ideas that have not yet been presented on the subject?</b>
(X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>2. Is the topic important to the context in which it is inserted?</b>
( X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>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?</b>
( X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>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?</b>
(X ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set?</b>
( X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>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?</b>
(X ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>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?</b>
( X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>8. Are the results consistent with the aim of the research, the theoretical framework and the methodology?</b>
( X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>9. Is the data calculated correctly and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?</b>
( X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No

<b>10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework?</b>
(X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented?</b>
( ) Yes (X) Partially ( ) No
<b>12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?</b>
(X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>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?</b>
(X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>Reviewer's comments on the cognitive dimension.</b>
- The discussions and final considerations could develop further questions about how the presence of large companies can affect the local context and the dissemination of knowledge from universities. This is not a topic that needs to be developed in depth, but it seems pertinent, given the observations and also the limitations set by the authors, that this should at least be a concern in relation to the topic being worked on. It is possible to argue that the presence of large companies “monopolizing” the output of university knowledge is a negative factor in the development of the issue of entrepreneurship and its relationship with social and local development
<b>B. METHODOLOGICAL DIMENSION</b>
<b>Precise description of the methods and techniques used.</b>
<b>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.</b>
(X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work?</b>
(X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field?</b>
(X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>4. Is the objective clearly written?</b>

( X ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explain how data will be collected (if applicable) and analyzed?</b>
( X ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>6. Is the methodology coherent with the theory and consistent with the results?</b>
( X ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>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?</b>
( X ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>Reviewer's comments on the methodological dimension.</b>
<b>C. AESTHETIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Writing, form and normalization.</b>
<b>1. Are the rules observed with regard to citations (ABNT 10520 - 2023), references (ABNT 6023 - 2018), presentation of illustrations and tables (title and source)?</b>
( ) Yes ( X ) Partially ( ) No
<b>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?</b>
( ) Yes ( X ) Partially ( ) No
<b>3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of adequate size and legibility for reading?</b>
( ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No
<b>Reviewer's comments on the aesthetic dimension</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>
( ) Accept ( X ) Accept with mandatory corrections ( ) Submit again for evaluation

Submit to another journal

Reject

**Reviewer's opinion/ Comments**

**- The text deals with an interesting and timely topic, contextualizing the relevance of the proposal made and developed and also working adequately with the data presented, I believe that the final considerations leave a little to be desired in the argumentation, bringing more analysis and bibliographic support than in fact the vision and considerations of the authors on the results and observations made from the data examined, perhaps a better job in the conclusions, as well as placing the conclusions in a topic of their own and separating them from the analysis could contribute to a better understanding of what the authors' position was in relation to the results obtained from the data analysis. We reiterate that the sole purpose of this opinion is to contribute to the development of the work in the best possible way.**

**List of mandatory corrections**

- Put the conclusions in a separate heading from the analysis.
- There are citations in the text that have no references (they have been marked in the text with comments)
- There are incomplete references (these have been marked in the text with comments)