



doi 10.22633/rpge.v29i00.19932



Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional
Online Journal of Policy and Educational Management



EDITORIA
IBERO-AMERICANA



unesp 

PARECER B

Como referenciar este artigo:

DENYSOVETS, I., HORODENSKA, K., & IKOLASHYNA, T. (2025). Formação e desenvolvimento do conceito de “categoria de formação de palavras” na derivatologia da língua literária ucraniana moderna. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 27, e025002. 10.22633/rpge.v29i00.19932

Submetido em: 17/01/2025

Revisões requeridas em: 03/02/2025

Aprovado em: 04/02/2025

Publicado em: 19/02/2025

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes

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

Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional (RPGE), Araraquara, v. 29, n. 00, e025002, 2025

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?

Yes Partially No

2. Is the topic important for its context?

Yes Partially 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?

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?

Yes Partially No

5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set?

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 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?

Yes Partially No

8. Are the results consistent with the research objective, the theoretical framework, and the methodology?

Yes Partially No

9. Is the data calculated correctly and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?

Yes Partially No

10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework?

Yes Partially No

11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented?

Yes Partially No

12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?

Yes Partially 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?

Yes Partially No

Evaluator's comments on the cognitive dimension.

In the *Introduction*, I believe that the topic needs to be worked on better. The authors need to clarify the problem and explain why they chose this topic. In addition, as there was no explicit problem in the *Introduction*, the *Final considerations* presented an introduction to the origin of the term "word-forming categories". I didn't feel that offered a conclusion to the "problem" raised. Need to change it.

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.

Yes Partially No

2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work?

Yes Partially No

3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field?

Yes Partially No

4. Is the objective clearly written?

Yes Partially No

5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explain how data will be collected (if applicable) and analyzed?

Yes Partially No

6. Is the methodology coherent with the theory and consistent with the results?

Yes Partially 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?

Yes Partially No

Evaluator's comments on the methodological dimension.

I believe that the summary needs to be more detailed in terms of the methodological methods used.

C. AESTHETIC DIMENSION

Writing, form and normalization.

1. Do you comply with the rules regarding citations (ABNT 10520 - 2023), references (ABNT 6023 - 2018), and 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

The article mentions a lot of authors, but in front of their name there is no year of the work being cited. In addition, the text is sometimes confusing and lacks cohesion and coherence.

Recommendation

- Accept
- Accept with mandatory corrections
- Submit again for evaluation
- Submit to another journal

Reject

Evaluator's Opinion/ Comments

The article presents an interesting discussion, but as previously mentioned, it still needs to be improved in many aspects.

In addition, the text is flawed. It's important that the authors take care of this and rewrite some parts, so that the text doesn't get tiresome for the reader.

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.

- Explain the methodology used in the summary;
- Make it clearer what the aim of the study is;
- The article does not include any recent theorists. It would be interesting to include more recent authors;
- Reformulate the final considerations to better present the results of the research;
- Cite theorists correctly throughout the text;
- Check ABNT standards.

Publication of the opinion, according to Open Science standards

I authorize publication without the evaluator's name

I authorize publication with the evaluator's name

I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer, being aware that it is mandatory for journals published by Editora Ibero-Americana.