



PARECER A

Como referenciar este artigo:

YAKOVLEV, A.; VOSKRESENSKIY, A.; SHEVCHENKOVA, A.; IVANOV, E. Philosophical foundations and actual problems of the content saturation of the educational course "global studies" in modern Russian higher educational institutions. **Nuances: Estudos sobre Educação**, Presidente Prudente, v. 36, n. 00, e025004, 2025. e-ISSN: 2236-0441. DOI: 10.32930/nuances.v36i00.10899



| **Submetido**: 02/02/2025

| **Revisões requeridas**: 01/03/2025

| **Aprovado**: 27/03/2025 | **Publicado**: 01/04/2025

Editora: Profa. Dra. Rosiane de Fátima Ponce

Editor Adjunto Executivo: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

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?
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?
5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives
set?
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?
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?
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?
12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?
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?
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

⊠ 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
(coherence); avoid repetition in the text of what is already written in the illustrations and tables?
illustrations and tables?
illustrations and tables? ☐ Yes ⊠ Partially ☐ No
illustrations and tables? ☐ Yes ⊠ Partially ☐ No 3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of
illustrations and tables? ☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No 3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of adequate size and legibility for reading?
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
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
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 -
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
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
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

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 article provides a very in-depth debate on current international political constitutions with a good basis in both Russian and Western philosophical debate, with good argumentation and text construction, there are some issues that need to be identified and better worked on in the text, especially in relation to the conceptualization of some terms used, but in general the text is very good. However, the text does not talk about education outside the title, so I suggest that it be sent to another journal in the field of political science or political philosophy or international relations, but it is not within the scope of an education journal.

•
List of mandatory corrections
_
Publication of the opinion, according to Open Science standards
☐ I authorize publication without the name of the reviewer
\square I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer
oxtimes I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer, being aware that the journals
of Editora Ibero-Americana, it is mandatory to.

(CC) BY-NC-SA