# PARECER A

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

| **A.          COGNITIVE DIMENSION**<br><br>**Sequential and logical chaining of the content of scientific ideas.** |
|---|
| **1. Does the article bring 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 clarify the research topic, present studies that addressed the problem or similar research, and point out the gap that the research covers/justification for the research?** |
| (X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No |
| **4. Does the introduction make clear what the research question is or the hypotheses (if applicable) and are the general and/or specific objectives consistent with the research question?** |
| ( ) Yes ( ) Partially ( X ) No |
| **5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the listed objectives?** |
| (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?** |
| ( ) Yes ( ) Partially ( X ) 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 works from the last five years?** |
| (X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No |
| **8. Are the results consistent with the research objective, the theoretical framework and the methodology?** |
| (X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No |
| **9. Does it present correct data collection and do the results indicate that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?** |
| ( X ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No |

| **10. Do the discussions present a coherent correlation with the theoretical framework?** |
|---|
| (X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No |
| **11. Do the discussions present a coherent correlation 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 sections of the article and pointing out limitations of the research itself and future research?** |
| ( ) Yes ( ) Partially ( X ) No |
| **Evaluator's comments on the cognitive dimension.** |
| The introduction is too short, without clearly establishing the objectives of the article and the gaps it covers. The theoretical framework is scarce and underdeveloped. There is no conclusion section. The text, as a whole, is too concise. |
| **B.        METHODOLOGICAL DIMENSION**<br><br>**Precise description of the methods and techniques used.** |
| **1. Does the title specify the content of the work more generally and is the subtitle (when applicable) a technical title more related to the theme? 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 manner consistent with the work?** |
| ( X ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No |
| **3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the area?** |
| (X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No |
| **4. Does it present a clearly written objective?** |
| ( ) Yes ( X) Partially ( ) No |
| **5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explicitly describe the method of data collection (if applicable) and analysis?** |
| ( ) Yes ( X ) Partially ( ) No |

| **6. Is the methodology consistent with the theory and consistent with the results?** |
|---|
| (X) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No |
| **7. If the research involves human beings, were the procedures carried out to comply with research ethics guidelines described or was the approval number of the work from the research ethics committee indicated?** |
| ( ) Yes ( ) Partially ( X ) No |
| **Evaluator's comments on the methodological dimension.** |
| **The objectives are not clearly described. The methodology is presented very briefly, and there is no specific detailing of the procedure and the basis that supports the investigation. There is also no further clarification regarding the ethical guidelines.** |
| **C.        AESTHETIC DIMENSION** **Writing, form and standardization.** |
| **1. Are the standards observed regarding citations (ABNT 10520 – 2023), references (ABNT 6023 – 2018), presentation of illustrations and tables (title and source)?** |
| ( X ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No |
| **2. Does the text present correct accentuation and spelling of words; nominal and verbal agreement; correct arrangement of words and connection between sentences or paragraphs (cohesion); logical relationship of the ideas presented (coherence); does it avoid repeating in the text 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 an appropriate size and legibility for reading?** |
| ( X ) Yes ( ) Partially ( ) No |
| **Evaluator's comments on the aesthetic dimension** |
| **There are errors in the title in Portuguese; the abstract uses words from Portuguese spoken in Portugal, and not from Brazilian Portuguese, which is the one adopted by the publisher. The article is so short that it does not allow it to qualitatively address the topic under discussion.** |
| **Recommendation** |
| ( ) To accept |
| ( ) Accept with mandatory corrections |

( ) Submit again for evaluation

( ) Submit to another journal

( X ) Reject

---

The opinions will be published without the reviewer's identity, in accordance with the principles of Open Science. The reviewer must inform whether he/she authorizes the publication of the opinions with his/her identity or authorizes them without his /her identity.

**Upon accepting the evaluation, the opinion will be published without identification. If the evaluator wishes to authorize his/her identification, please inform us in response to the evaluation request.**

**Evaluator's opinion/Comments**

**The article deals with a highly relevant topic. However, there are unavoidable deviations, such as the generic text of the introduction, which does not clearly explain the research objectives, the theoretical-methodological direction and the stages of the article. The methodology is described sparsely, making it impossible to understand the research process in detail. There is no conclusion section to summarize what was done in the research. Therefore, it is recommended that the article be REJECTED, requiring a complete reformulation process.**

**List of mandatory corrections**

If the recommendation was "accept with mandatory corrections", fill it out as a list of actions that the authors must take. We ask for your cooperation in writing the items in a way that the authors are clear about what they must do. Fill out one item per topic. Examples:

- Check ABNT standards.

- Include references from the last 5 years.

**- Reword article.**