

# Evaluation Form of Revista Pensar

## Welcome to the Evaluation Form of Revista Pensar

Journal of Legal Sciences of the University of Fortaleza – e-ISSN: 2317-2150

**Dear Reviewer,**

We thank you for your valuable contribution to the editorial process of *Revista Pensar*. This form aims to standardize and facilitate the evaluation of submitted articles, promoting greater clarity and efficiency in the communication between authors, reviewers, and the editorial team.

The form is divided into 4 sections:

- **Reviewer Information – basic details to identify the evaluation.**
- **Technical Evaluation of the Article – objective criteria regarding structure, language, content, and methodology.**
- **Suggestions and Comments – space for qualitative observations and detailed suggestions.**
- **Final Evaluation – score assigned to the article and recommendation regarding its publication.**

 **Important:** In the “Article Number” field, please indicate only the initial number that appears in the file name received (e.g., if the file name is 15850-Texto do Artigo-66246-67662-2-20250317, enter only 15850).

If you have any questions, please contact the editorial board via the institutional email or through the Editors’ WhatsApp.

Your participation is essential to maintaining the academic and scientific quality of our journal.

**Thank you very much!**

Editorial Board – Revista Pensar  
University of Fortaleza

O e-mail do participante ([leszekcichobiazinski@gmail.com](mailto:leszekcichobiazinski@gmail.com)) foi registrado durante o envio deste formulário.

## **Section 1: Reviewer Information**

Full Name \*

Leszek Cichobłaziński

Email \*

leszek.cichoblasinski@pcz.pl

Highest Degree \*

PhD

ORCID \*

0000-0002-7743-4574

Institution/Affiliation \*

Częstochowa University of Technology

## 📌 Section 2: Article Information

Title of the Article \*

Intangible Cultural Heritage in Religious Contexts: a Comparative Legal Study

Article Number (Manuscript ID)

\*

📌 Please enter the article number as it appears in the file name received (example: 15850-*Texto do Artigo...*).

→ Enter only the first number, before “-Texto do Artigo”.

15981

### 🚩 Section 3: Technical Evaluation of the Article

1. Does the article title objectively reflect its content? \*

- Yes
- Partially
- ✗ No

2. Is the abstract clear and concise? Are the keywords appropriate? \*

- Yes
- Partially
- ✗ No

3. Is the article precise and objective? Does it have proper language and a style suitable for \* its purpose?

- Yes
- Partially
- ✗ No

4. Is the article well-structured, clearly stating the problem and developing coherently with its \* objectives and results?

 Yes

 Partially

 No

5. Is the methodology appropriate? Does the article sufficiently explain its methodological \* choices?

 Yes

 Partially

 No

6. Does the article contain inaccuracies or improper use of the adopted theoretical \* framework?

 Yes

 Partially

 No

7. Does the article appropriately cite and discuss relevant bibliography on the subject? \*

 Yes

 Partially

 No

8. Is the article innovative in its field? Does it propose research paths for future development? \*

 Yes

 Partially

 No

9. Does the article contain false or incorrect statements regarding facts, evidence, sources, or other relevant information? \*

 Yes

 Partially

 No

#### 10. Title suggestions (if necessary)

 Write one or more title suggestions, if you consider it appropriate.

No suggestions.

#### 12. Suggestions for modifying the abstract and keywords

 Indicate adjustments that could make the abstract clearer or the keywords more suitable.

No suggestions.

**13. Sugestões bibliográficas**

 Caso considere necessário, sugira fontes ou autores relevantes para enriquecer o artigo.

No sugestions.

**14. Observations on citations**

 Point out any inconsistencies, omissions, or issues in the citation format.

No comments.

\*

**15. Substantial observations**

 Provide broader comments on the content, structure, or approach of the article.

The paper is focused on important problem. Scientific problem is clearly stated. The methodology of the study is chosen appropriately, the structure of the text is consistent with the rules of writing scientific papers. The bibliography is appropriate to the problem.

\*

**16. Additional comments to the author**

 Final message that will be sent directly to the author.

Very good paper which can be published without changes and corrects.

 **Section 4: Final Evaluation**

**17. Assign a score from 0 to 10 to the evaluated article \***

Type: Linear scale

From: 0

To: 10

Label at 0: "Minimum score"

Label at 10: "Maximum score"

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

**18. Final recommendation \***

- The article should be published without changes
- The article should be published if the suggested modifications are incorporated
- The article should be rejected

 **Note:** If you choose to recommend modifications, please detail your suggestions in the previous responses.

Este conteúdo não foi criado nem aprovado pelo Google.

Google Formulários