

Guidelines for Evaluation

Dear Reviewers, before deciding to accept or decline an invitation to review a paper for the Boletim de Geociências da Petrobras (BGP), please reflect on these questions:

- Is the paper related to your area of expertise and activity? Only accept if you believe you can provide a high-quality review.
- Do you have any possible conflicts of interest? Inform the editor when responding. For more information, see the “**Conflict of Interest**” section below.
- Do you have availability? Reviewing can be a demanding task — before committing, assess whether you can meet the deadline.

Reply to the invitation promptly, even if you are declining. Any delay in your response holds up the publication process and extends the authors' waiting time.

If you can't submit a review on time, inform the editors and give an accurate estimate for when you can complete it if they still need you to do it.

Notify the editors right away if you observe any irregularities, have ethical concerns, detect significant similarities between the manuscript and another submission or a published article, or suspect misconduct in the research or writing processes. Reviewers should maintain confidentiality regarding these issues and refrain from conducting independent investigations unless asked for additional information or advice by the journal.

General Guidelines

Your review will be managed through the OJS system, used for submissions to the Boletim de Geociências da Petrobras. Therefore, to access the article and conduct your review, click the link in the invitation email you received, which will take you to the submission/review system.

Make sure you are familiar with the specific guidelines of the bulletin, available on the [journal's homepage](#), and the [author guidelines](#).

BGP uses a structured peer review process, in which you will answer a series of questions designed to facilitate systematic communication of improvement recommendations to the article. These questions cover various aspects of the manuscript, including data analysis quality, reproducibility, and overall text clarity. An overview of the main questions can be found in the “**Evaluation Questionnaire**” section.

Your analysis will help the editor decide whether to publish the article and will benefit the author in improving their manuscript. Provide a general opinion and observations on the text politely and constructively, avoiding personal or *ad hominem* comments.

It is essential to provide contributions on possible points of improvement. Explain and justify your conclusions so that both editors and authors fully understand the reasoning behind your comments. Additionally, indicate if your comments represent your opinion or are based on data and evidence.

Anonymity

We do not disclose the identities of reviewers to authors or other reviewers unless a reviewer voluntarily signs their comments to the authors. To increase the transparency of the review process, reviewers may sign their reports if they feel comfortable doing so.

We ask reviewers not to identify themselves to authors while the manuscript is under consideration without the editor's knowledge. All communication with editors and submission of reviews should be conducted only through the OJS system and the links provided in the invitation. Do not contact authors directly without prior authorization from the editors.

Confidentiality

When accepting to review a paper, you must consider the materials as confidential, not sharing them without the editors' permission. Since peer review is confidential, do not disclose review details without authorization from the editors and authors.

Remember that even after completing your review, the paper and any linked data remain confidential. Therefore, do not share or discuss review information without the editor's permission.

Generative AI

Generative AI tools should not be used to assist in the review process, evaluation, or decision-making of a manuscript. Reviewing a scientific paper involves responsibilities that only humans can assume. The critical thinking and analysis required for peer review exceed the capabilities of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies, presenting the risk of producing incorrect, incomplete, or partial conclusions.

Reviewers and editors should not upload the manuscript or any part of it into generative AI tools, as there are no guarantees about where the materials are sent, stored, or viewed, nor how they will be used in the future. This may violate authors' confidentiality, property rights, and data privacy, as well as the terms of use of these tools. As highlighted in the “**Confidentiality**” section, submitted manuscripts should be treated as confidential documents.

Confidentiality also applies to the peer review report and communications about the manuscript, such as notifications or decision letters, as they may contain confidential information. Therefore, these documents should not be uploaded to a generative AI tool, even if to improve language or readability.

Recommendations and Final Decision

The **Evaluation Questionnaire** includes a specific question for your recommendation. The final decision on the acceptance or rejection of the paper lies with the editors. The

editors will consider all opinions and may request another evaluation or ask the author for a revised version of the paper before deciding.

The categories that editors use to classify papers are:

- Accept without revision
- Review, inviting authors to revise their manuscript to address specific concerns before a final decision is made.
- Reject but indicate to authors that additional work may justify a new submission.
- Reject promptly, usually for reasons such as not fitting the journal's scope, lack of originality, insufficient conceptual innovation, or serious technical and/or interpretative problems.

Keep in mind that you can send individual comments to the editors and the authors.

We take this opportunity to express, on behalf of the Petrobras Geosciences Bulletin, our editorial board, and the authors, our sincere gratitude for the valuable contribution you have dedicated to the article.

Conflict of Interest

Disclose any potential conflicts of interest, whether personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political, or religious. Consult the Editorial Board if you are unsure about a conflict's relevance.

Notify the Editor-in-Chief if you work at the same institution as any of the authors, have been their mentor or mentee, collaborated closely, shared grants in the past 3 years, or have a close personal relationship with them.

If you have contributed to any portion of the work presented in the manuscript, please decline the review. Similarly, refuse the review if you have been asked to review a manuscript that is very similar to one you are currently writing or that is being reviewed by another journal.

Reviewers must promptly inform the Editor-in-Chief and seek advice if they encounter any undisclosed conflicts of interest or situations that may affect an impartial review.