

(Des)troços Evaluation Form

Preliminary Evaluation of the Manuscript

1. Does the manuscript address theoretical or empirical elements of its field of study?

☐ Hardly at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Moderately ☐ Quite a lot ☐ Extremely

2. Does the manuscript present novelty or scientific relevance (topic, theory, method, result)?

☐ Hardly at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Moderately ☐ Quite a lot ☐ Extremely

3. Do the title, abstract, and keywords accurately represent the content of the manuscript?

☐ Hardly at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Moderately ☐ Quite a lot ☐ Extremely

4. Does the manuscript demonstrate methodological rigor?

☐ Hardly at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Moderately ☐ Quite a lot ☐ Extremely

5. Is the manuscript well written and clear?

☐ Hardly at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Moderately ☐ Quite a lot ☐ Extremely

6. Does the manuscript demonstrate quality in conceptual development and argumentation?

☐ Hardly at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Moderately ☐ Quite a lot ☐ Extremely

7. Does the manuscript follow standards of scientific best practices (absence of excessive self-citation and plagiarism)?

☐ Hardly at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Moderately ☐ Quite a lot ☐ Extremely

8. If requested for revision, does the manuscript have potential for substantial improvement?

☐ Hardly at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Moderately ☐ Quite a lot ☐ Extremely ☐ Not applicable

Detailed Evaluation of the Manuscript

1. Evaluation summary

(Write here a summary in your own words, highlighting what was done, the possible contribution, and the potential impacts of the manuscript.)

2. Assessment of writing and editorial compliance

(Write here your analysis and suggestions regarding the adequacy of the title, abstract, keywords, and section headings in relation to the content, as well as the presence or absence of grammatical, spelling, and typing errors, and compliance with citation and reference standards.)

3. Content evaluation

(Write here your analysis and suggestions regarding the manuscript's response to the research question, the fulfillment of the described methodology, the didactic structure, the development of the core argument, the extent of the results compared to the objectives defined in the introduction, the coherence of the conclusions based on the results presented, and the (in)visibility of relevant works by other authors on the chosen topic.)

4. Final recommendation

- ☐ **Accept** (the manuscript is fully approved, with no changes requested from the author)
- ☐ **Mandatory revisions** (when the manuscript has merit but still requires adjustments to align with the guidelines; the author is asked to make the necessary corrections)
- ☐ **Reject** (when the manuscript has merit but would require substantial changes, or when it has no merit at all)
- ☐ **See comments** (when none of the options reflect the evaluation; the editor will be informed and will take the reviewer's comments into account)
- ☐ **Submit to another journal** (when the manuscript has merit but does not fit the scope of the journal)