

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

When reviewing, ensure your feedback focuses on the author, since many comments will be included in the decision letter. Also, give detailed feedback to help editors assist the author in improving the manuscript.

Keep in mind that there will be a chance to provide separate feedback to both the editors and the authors. Since not all questions are relevant to every type of manuscript, some questions are optional.

Questions for all types of papers (originals, brief notes, and review)

1. Does the content of this paper align with the interests of the readers of the Boletim de Geociências da Petrobras?
2. Are the context and literature up-to-date and appropriate for the study? Does the literature review need to be expanded or improved?
3. Are the primary and secondary objectives and justifications clearly established?
4. Are the study's materials and methods described in sufficient detail to ensure their replicability or reproducibility?
5. If applicable, comment on statistical analyses. Are additional analyses or statistical measures needed (e.g., reporting CIs, effect sizes, sensitivity analyses)?
6. If the paper reports code, software, algorithms, or raw data, did you review their accuracy, validity, and FAIRness?
7. Is the presentation of results, including the quality and number of tables and figures, appropriate for best presenting the study's findings?
8. Do the data support the interpretation of the results and the study's conclusions? Is it necessary to expand the explanation on the generalization of the findings or the comparison with existing studies?
9. Have the authors clearly emphasized the limitations of their study/theory/methods/arguments?
10. Have the authors highlighted the innovation and/or originality (contribution, addition to scientific knowledge or field) of the study?
11. Does the title need improvement?
12. Does the abstract summarize the main findings of the research, or does it need improvement?
13. Are there any serious flaws that invalidate the study or make it unpublishable?
14. Could the manuscript benefit from language and textual structure revision?

Additional questions for review articles

15. Did the authors clarify the reason for writing a review on this topic?
16. Does the review article present a good overview of the field's evolution and offer perspectives on its future?
17. What is your recommendation to the editors?