

## OPINION A

### How to reference this paper:

Pavlova, N., Stepanova, T., Glushko, O., Burchak, L., Prytuliak, L., Koycheva, T., & Barbashova, I. (2026). Innovation-driven approaches to the professional training of future specialists in higher education. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30, e026039. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30i00.20845>



| **Submitted:** 11/01/2026  
| **Revisions required:** 10/04/2026  
| **Approved:** 13/04/2026  
| **Published:** 29/04/2026

---

**Editor:** Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes  
**Deputy Executive Editor:** Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

## REVIEW FORM

**Reviewer: Flávio Henrique Machado Moreira**

<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>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>2. Is the topic important to the context in which it is inserted?</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set?</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>8. Are the results consistent with the aim of the research, the theoretical framework and the methodology?</b>

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>9. Is the data calculated correctly and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework?</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented?</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Reviewer's comments on the cognitive dimension.</b>
-
<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>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work?</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field?</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>4. Is the objective clearly written?</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<b>5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explain how data will be collected (if applicable) and analyzed?</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>6. Is the methodology coherent with the theory and consistent with the results?</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of adequate size and legibility for reading?</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Reviewer's comments on the aesthetic dimension</b>
-
<b>Recommendation</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Accept <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept with mandatory corrections <input type="checkbox"/> Submit again for evaluation

Submit to another journal

Reject

The reviews will be published without the identity of the reviewer, in accordance with the principles of Open Science. The reviewer must state whether he/she authorizes the publication of the review with his/her identity or authorizes it without his/her identity.

**Once the reviewer agrees to the review, the review will be published without their identity. If the reviewer wishes to authorize their identification, please inform it in response to the review request.**

#### Reviewer's opinion/ Comments

- This paper addresses a contemporary issue and a recurring debate across various fields, including higher education, which lends relevance to the proposed discussion. Nevertheless, there are some issues that need to be addressed before the paper can be recommended for publication.

- The abstract of the paper needs to be rewritten according to the journal's guidelines.

- The introduction provides a brief overview of the theory underlying the topic, but it does not actually offer an authorial introduction to the work—explaining the authors' proposal and how they intend to carry it out in the text. It would be very important to add a few more paragraphs that provide a proper introduction to the work that will be discussed in the following pages.

- The methodology must specify how data collection was conducted, not only from a sampling perspective but also from an ethical standpoint—including whether anonymity was ensured, participation was voluntary, and an ethics committee was involved, etc. Also, given the nature of the study, it would be highly relevant to specify which courses or fields the sample was drawn from—whether it included students from various courses or different fields, or only students from technology, education, etc. This type of information is particularly relevant given the small sample size ( $n=35$ ).

- There is a serious error in the calculations presented in Table 2; when the factors are added together, the total exceeds 100%, as indicated in the calculations. This needs to be reviewed and corrected.

- Given the more statistical nature of the analyses, it would be highly relevant for the final considerations to include a more detailed explanatory section, rather than merely stating, in a succinct and direct manner, conclusions drawn directly from the data;

instead, they should present the authors' own words and perspectives in interpreting the data in light of the theoretical framework and the proposed approach, this would provide a more comprehensive conclusion to the work.

In the conclusions, it is also important to highlight the study's limitations. As has already been indirectly noted, the study was conducted in only one location; however, other limitations could be mentioned, such as the small sample size, the need for implementation, and a subsequent analysis of the implementation, etc.

We reiterate that the sole purpose of this opinion is to contribute as effectively as possible to the progress of the work.

#### **List of mandatory corrections**

- The abstract must be no longer than 150 words and must include an overview of the study, its relevance to the field, the methodology, a brief summary of the discussions/analyses, and a summary of the conclusions;
- The introduction must be revised in accordance with the above opinion;
- The methodology must specify the data collection process; since it involves human subjects, ethical considerations must be addressed;
- There is a serious error in Table 2, where the total exceeds 100% of the calculation; this must be corrected;
- The conclusions must be expanded upon in accordance with the above opinion.

#### **Publication of the opinion, according to Open Science standards**

- I authorize publication without the name of the reviewer
- I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer
- I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer, being aware that the journals of Editora Ibero-Americana, it is mandatory to.

**Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação**  
Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation

