REGEPE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS JOURNAL

EDITORA ANEGEPE Associação Nacional de Estudos em Empreendedorismo e Gestão de Pequenas Empresas

ISSN: 2965-1506 v.14, Jan. / Dec., 2025 https://regepe.org.br/

PEER REVIEW REPORT OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Open access

Manuscript data:

Type of manuscript : *Research article (Theoretical-empirical)*

Title : *When tensions and barriers destroy social impact businesses: Multiple case studies based on Brazilian experience*

Authors : *Maryane Cristina de Souza Crestani, Graziela Dias Alperstedt, and Helena Kuerten de Salles*

Article ID: e2528

Manuscript's DOI : https://doi.org/10.14211/regepe.esbj.e2528.

Peer review report data:

How to cite :

Anonymous, Nakagawa, M., Martens, C. D. P. & Morais-da-Silva R. L. (2025). Peer review report of the manuscript: When tensions and barriers destroy social impact businesses: Multiple case studies based on Brazilian experience. *REGEPE Entrepreneurship and Small Business Journal*, 14, e2528. https://doi.org/10.14211/regepe.esbj.e2528pr.

Round ↓	Reviewers			
	1	2	3	4
1	R1R1	R1R2	R1R3	
2	R2R1	R2R2		
3	R3R1			
4				

Editorial data:

ROUND 1:

1st Reviewer: Anonymous

Completed : 2024-08-27 06:53 PM
Recommendation : Revisions Required

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

- [x] Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.
- [ ] Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.
- [ ] Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

- [ ] Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.
- [ ] Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.
- [x] I do NOT agree to open the review.

2nd Reviewer: Marcus Nakagawa

Completed : 2024-11-06 08:05 PM
Recommendation : Accept Submission

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.
Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.
Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.
■ Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.
Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.
Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.
Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.
■ Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.
Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.
Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.
Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.
■ Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.
Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.
Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.
Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.
■ Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.
Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing..
Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.
Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.
■ Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.
Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

■ Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

The article has a good writing, but not a fluently english.
The main objective is Ok, but it could be a comparison with the traditional smal companies in Brazil. Sebrae have some datas of companies deaths and they do an annual questionary about it. And they have all datas and the historical graphics regarding the companies deaths.
And maybe is the same reason.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

■ Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

■ Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.

3rd Reviewer: Cristina Dai Prá Martens

Completed : 2024-12-24 12:14 AM
Recommendation : Revisions Required

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

- Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.
- Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.
- ■ Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.
- Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.
- Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

- Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.
- Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.
- ■ Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.
- Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.
- Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

- Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.
- Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.
- ■ Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.
- Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.
- Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

- Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.
- Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.
- ■ Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.
- Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.
- Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

- Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing..
- Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.
- ■ Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.
- Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.
- Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

■ Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/ subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

Inicialmente, agradeço pela oportunidade de revistar este artigo. Ele aborda uma temática relevante e pouco explorada, trazendo uma contribuição significativa para a literatura sobre Negócios de Impacto Social (NIS). No entanto, há aspectos que podem ser aprimorados para fortalecer a consistência e a profundidade do trabalho, que são a seguir apresentados.

O objetivo do estudo é claro e tem grande relevância. Recomenda-se que os autores padronizem sua redação, pois no resumo ele tem uma redação, e na introdução tem outra diferente. Ao final da seção de introdução, recomenda-se conectar o objetivo à metodologia empregada e aos resultados do estudo. Na seção de introdução os autores mencionam uma revisão sistemática realizada em 2021, mas não fornecem a devida citação, deixando dúvida se foi uma revisão consultada ou se foi feita pelos próprios autores (o que deveria ficar claro), já que essa revisão é utilizada para justificar a lacuna do estudo.

A revisão de literatura é adequada e cita autores relevantes no campo. Contudo, ela poderia ser mais aprofundada, incorporando estudos recentes e explorando com maior detalhe as interações entre hibridismo organizacional e as barreiras de entrada mencionadas, o que enriqueceria a contextualização teórica do fenômeno investigado.
No segundo parágrafo da seção 2, os autores apresentam ao menos cinco termos utilizados para descrever os negócios de impacto no Brasil, porém sem deixar claras as fontes. O parágrafo, que consiste em três frases, contém apenas uma citação, o que limita a argumentação teórica. Esse padrão se repete no parágrafo seguinte e em outras partes do texto, evidenciando a necessidade de uma fundamentação teórica mais consistente.
No sexto parágrafo da mesma seção, há uma menção às demandas concorrentes das empresas sociais, seguida de uma definição de demandas conflitantes, que não é devidamente integrada ao contexto. Esse trecho carece de maior clareza sobre a relação entre os conceitos abordados.
Além disso, a introdução ao tema das tensões no sétimo parágrafo ocorre de maneira abrupta, sem estabelecer uma conexão fluida com os parágrafos anteriores. Essa falta de transição prejudica a coesão do texto.

A metodologia, baseada em estudo de casos múltiplos, é adequada para o desenvolvimento do estudo. Sinto falta de um maior detalhamento sobre o motivo de escolha dos 3 casos, bem como sobre a escolha dos stakeholders chave. Também sinto falta de explicações sobre o roteiro de entrevistas e a coleta de dados: o que o roteiro de entrevistas contemplava? tinha as mesmas questões para as empresas e para os stakeholders chave? as entrevistas foram presenciais? Com relação à coleta e análise, foi feita alguma triangulação dos dados? É preciso dar mais detalhes a respeito. Sobre a análise temática, os temas emergiram todos do campo ou algum teve base na literatura?

Os resultados são apresentados de forma clara, com uma análise das causas que levaram ao encerramento dos NIS estudados. A organização em dimensões socioambientais e comerciais facilita a compreensão e destaca a relevância prática e teórica do estudo. O uso de tabelas para sintetizar os achados é um ponto positivo. No entanto, a conexão entre os resultados e a literatura existente poderia ser mais aprofundada, estabelecendo uma ligação mais consistente entre os resultados encontrados e a literatura de base. Isso inclui realizar a amarração com a literatura citada, destacando como os resultados confirmam, ampliam ou contradizem estudos sobre hibridismo organizacional, tensões paradoxais e barreiras institucionais em NIS.

A conclusão é consistente com os resultados apresentados, reforçando as principais contribuições do estudo. Ela destaca a importância de políticas de apoio aos NIS e propõe caminhos para futuras pesquisas. Os autores poderiam mencionar as limitações do estudo e incluir reflexões mais detalhadas sobre implicações práticas e teóricas para gestores e formuladores de políticas públicas.

Em termos de forma, o texto tem escrita clara, mas apresenta passagens que poderiam ser mais objetivas e concisas. Alguns trechos apresentam construções que comprometem a fluidez da leitura. Um exemplo é a repetição do termo "inherently" três vezes em dois parágrafos consecutivos (seção 2). Uma detalhada revisão do texto poderá sanar questões a exemplo dessa.

De forma resumida, recomenta-se:

- incorporar estudos mais recentes (últimos 5 anos), enriquecendo a discussão teórica e alinhando o trabalho às pesquisas mais recentes.
- incrementar a seção de introdução agregando, ao final, o método utilizado e uma frase que remeta aos resultados.
- fazer uma detalhara revisão do texto, de modo a adotar uma linguagem mais fluida e objetiva, com transições mais claras entre os parágrafos e seções.
- reforçar a seção de método melhor justificando a escolha dos casos e dos atores chaves, apresentando mais detalhes sobre a realização das entrevistas, detalhando sobre a triangulação dos dados e a análise temática (algo veio da literatura?).
- reforçar a conexão entre os resultados e a base teórica, deixando mais claras as contribuições para a teoria e as implicações do estudo.

Parabenizo os autores pelo estudo desenvolvido.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

■ Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

■ Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.

ROUND 2:

1st Reviewer: Cristina Dai Prá Martens

Completed : 2025-03-01 05:57 PM
Recommendation : Accept Submission

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.
Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.
Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.
■ Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.
Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.
Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.
Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.
■ Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.
Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.
Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.
Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.
■ Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.
Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.
Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.
Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.
■ Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.
Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing..
Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.
Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.
■ Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.
Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

■ Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

A nova versão do artigo hora analisada passou por diversos aprimoramento. Em geral, os pontos levantados em minha revisão foram atendidos, e o texto agora apresenta mais consistência e coerência. Estou satisfeita com a nova versão apresentada pelos autores. Parabenizo os autores pelo estudo desenvolvido e pelo avanço na nova versão apresentada.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

■ Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

■ Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.

2nd Reviewer: Rodrigo Luiz Morais-da-Silva

Completed : 2025-02-24 02:21 PM
Recommendation : Revisions Required

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

- Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.
- ■ Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.
- Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.
- Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.
- Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

- Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.
- Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.
- Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.
- ■ Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.
- Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

- Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.
- Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.
- Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.
- ■ Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.
- Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

- Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.
- Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.
- Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.
- ■ Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.
- Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

- Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing..
- Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.
- Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.
- ■ Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.
- Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

■ Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

Dear authors, thank you for sending the new version of the article. It is more interesting, but I still see room for improvement in some parts.

- The title should be more eye-catching to highlight the uniqueness of the manuscript. How about something more specific to grab the attention of readers? When tensions and barriers destroy social impact businesses: multiple case studies based on Brazilian experience

- In the introduction, I suggest normally citing the article referred to in the excerpt "a systematic review conducted in 2021 by the authors of this paper identified 24 studies that only briefly touched on factors leading these enterprises to go out of business", if it has been published. If it has not been published, I suggest removing this part. A simple review done in 2021 and not published would need to be redone for the present day. Without a citation, it does not contribute to the work. Therefore, I suggest 1) if it has been published, cite it normally in the final version of this work; 2) if it has not been, I suggest removing the excerpt or developing a new, updated search.

- Did the social enterprises or institutions whose names were published in the article agree to this disclosure? I ask because we had problems with this same aspect recently. The person who had authorized the disclosure of the name left the company and the new manager did not approve of the way the company's name was published. If this authorization exists, with documentary validity, great. If it does not exist, I suggest that they reconsider whether disclosing the name would be the best course of action.

- The study also has an approach that is very much related to the Brazilian domestic environment, which I see as a challenging limitation for a journal that is publishing in English and seeking to internationalize. Talking about theoretical contributions and relating them to a city is somewhat limited. Relating the local context to practical contributions is fine, but not to theoretical aspects. Can the authors answer, by reading the conclusion, what are the main theoretical contributions of the article considering the literature as a whole? By theoretical contributions, I mean which elements are new to the literature, which elements are distinct, and which were confirmed based on previously consulted literature. This clarification is fundamental to the work, but I see that the current version still fails to answer these points.

- The text needs to be professionally proofread, even if it is done using software like Grammarly. The current text still has grammatical errors, but its main limitation is that it is still very much in the style of direct translation. The text needs to look more like the written form of the English language. If it is not possible to have a professional proofreader, current software that uses AI can be very interesting to improve the fluidity of the text.

I hope I have helped you improve the article. I hope I have helped you improve the article's proposal. The study is very interesting, so improvements will be very welcome for reading and later citation in academia.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

■ Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

■ Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.

ROUND 3:

1st Reviewer: Rodrigo Luiz Morais-da-Silva

Completed : 2025-06-01 10:27 PM
Recommendation : Accept Submission

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.
Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.
Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.
■ Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.
Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.
Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.
Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.
■ Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.
Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.
Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.
Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.
■ Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.
Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.
Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.
Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.
■ Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.
Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing..
Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.
Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.
■ Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.
Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

■ Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/ subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

A nova versão do manuscrito está muito bem desenvolvida e com o antendimento a praticamente todos os pontos solicitados anteriormente. Portanto, não vejo necessidades de novas rodadas de revisão e recomendo aprovação.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

■ Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

■ Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.