

OPINION A

How to reference this paper:

Yu, Q., & Bakhir, N. M. (2026). From formal recognition to semantic understanding: rethinking Falangcai porcelain pattern instruction in ceramic design education Jingdezhen, Jiangxi Province in China. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30(esp1), e026025. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30iesp1.20933>.



| **Submitted:** 07/01/2026
| **Revisions required:** 22/02/2026
| **Approved:** 16/03/2026
| **Published:** 30/03/2026

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes

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

REVIEW FORM

**Article title: From formal recognition to semantic understanding:
Rethinking Falangcai Porcelain pattern instruction in ceramic design
education Jiangdezhen, Jiangxi province in Chine**

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?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is the topic important to the context in which it is inserted?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> 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?

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Submit again for evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Submit to another journal <input type="checkbox"/> Reject
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Reviewer's opinion/ Comments
<p>- The article does not fit within the scope of the journal as it does not deal with issues related to education. There are mentions in the text about learning opportunities and knowledge transfer through porcelain representations, and even a list and specifications of the high-level training required to work with ceramics and the aforementioned porcelain, but without any focus on educational issues per se. The work is a hybrid of history, semiotics, archaeology, and even chemistry, in addition to ceramic creation techniques. The work itself is quite extensive and highly elaborate, providing a very in-depth analysis of the topic in question, but it is outside the scope of the journal.</p> <p>Therefore, the recommendation is that the paper be rejected and/or submitted to another journal that is more appropriate for the field of study.</p>
List of mandatory corrections
-
Publication of the opinion, according to Open Science standards
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I authorize publication without the name of the reviewer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

