

OPINION A

How to reference this paper:

Ali, A. H., Hassan, T. R. R., Bidin, A., Ghazali, M. F. M., Ramli, F. N. A., Nazri, S. Y. M., & Hassan, I. (2026). Thoughts on education and culture in the works of Awang Had Salleh. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30(esp1), e026020. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30iesp1.20909>



| Submitted: 05/01/2026
| Revisions required: 19/01/2026
| Approved: 22/02/2026
| Published: 30/03/2026

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes

Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

REVIEW FORM

Article title: Thoughts on education and culture in the works of Awang Had Salleh

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 to the context in which it is inserted?
☒ 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?
☐ 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 aim of the research, 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 the limitations of the research itself and future research?
☐ 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.
☒ 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 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 ☒ 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 ☒ 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
-
Recommendation
☐ Accept
☒ Accept with mandatory corrections
☐ 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
- The work presented offers an interesting analysis that approaches the field of educational philosophy, but which is also relevant to the construction of social and political ideas and practices in the context under study, proving to be a very interesting and relevant analysis for educational studies. That said, there are a few issues that need to be addressed before the work can be submitted for publication: - The abstract must be no longer than 150 words and cover the following points: an introduction to the topic, its relevance, methodology, a summary of the discussions/analyses, and a summary of the conclusions. - It is also necessary to check the citations included in the body of the text, as they are incomplete. - The conclusions need to be better developed. Although they objectively address what was presented in the work, there is not much authorial participation. There are many possibilities for better developing this section by involving the authors in tying together the three points of the work discussed in the paper. It would also be very enriching if the authors took a position by comparing what was worked on in this study with its relevance in the current Malaysian context, even with the possibility of proposals and indications of interaction between the analyses and the educational system and current society. - In addition, a detailed review of the writing would be helpful, as there are some passages with repeated and slightly confusing sentences. It is reiterated that the sole purpose of this opinion is to contribute to the authors' work in the best possible way.

List of mandatory corrections

- Rewrite the summary according to the guidelines presented in this opinion.
- Check the citations in the body of the text
- Develop the final considerations with greater authorial participation to conclude the work as presented in this 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
Review, formatting, standardization, and Translation

