REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.:IJAR-56449

Title: Challenges and perspectives for Promoting Linguistic Pluralism and Ancestral Knowledge in indigenous school education in Brazil.

Recommendation:
Accept as it is ……………………………….
Accept after minor revision………………
Accept after major revision ………………
Do not accept (*Reasons below*) ………

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity			√	
Significance	√			

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This article addresses a critically important topic: the promotion of linguistic pluralism, ancestral knowledge, and cultural sustainability in indigenous school education in Brazil. The manuscript engages with relevant theoretical frameworks (decoloniality, critical interculturality, linguistic rights) and legislative developments (1988 Constitution, Law 11.645/08). The topic is timely and significant, particularly given contemporary global discussions about epistemic justice, cultural preservation, and inclusive education. However, the manuscript in its current form requires substantial revision to meet publication standards.

Major Concerns

1. Structural and Organizational Issues

The manuscript presents significant structural problems that impede readability and scholarly coherence:

- **No clear title** is provided at the beginning of the manuscript
- **Repeated text blocks** appear throughout (notably on pages 4, 7, 9, and 10-11), suggesting incomplete editing or draft material left in the final version
- **Inconsistent formatting** of headings, graphs, and citations
- **Graphs and figures** lack proper integration with the text and sometimes appear with incomplete or unclear labels

Required action:

- Provide a clear, concise title that accurately reflects the manuscript's content
- Remove all redundant and repeated text passages
- Ensure each figure is properly introduced, explained, and integrated into the argument
- Conduct a thorough editorial review for consistency

2. Methodological Clarity

While the methodology section (pages 4-7) describes a five-stage qualitative approach, several concerns emerge:

- The distinction between the initial brief methodology description (pages 4-5) and the subsequent detailed five-stage description (pages 5-7) creates redundancy
- The methodology claims to be "qualitative, descriptive-analytical" but the analytical procedures could be more explicitly linked to the theoretical framework
- The selection criteria for sources (relevance, recency, diversified sources) are appropriate but could be more specific regarding inclusion/exclusion decisions
- There is limited discussion of how the "thematic categorization" was conducted or validated

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Required action:
- Consolidate the methodology into a single, coherent section
- Provide clearer justification for source selection and analytical procedures
- Discuss potential limitations of the methodological approach
- Explain how trustworthiness and rigor were ensured in the analysis

3. Theoretical Framework Integration

The theoretical framework (pages 2-4) introduces key concepts and scholars, but:
- The transition from concepts to analysis could be strengthened
- Graph 2 (table of theoretical references) is useful but the connections between these theorists and the subsequent analysis could be more explicitly drawn
- Some concepts (e.g., "epistemicide," "linguicide," "decoloniality") are introduced but not consistently operationalized throughout the discussion

Required action:
- Strengthen the linkage between theoretical concepts and the analysis of policies and practices
- Demonstrate more explicitly how each theoretical lens informs the interpretation of findings
- Consider whether all cited theorists are equally engaged or if some are mentioned but not utilized

4. Data Presentation and Interpretation

The manuscript includes several graphs and figures that present statistical or synthesized data:
- Graph 1 (regional distribution of indigenous languages) is relevant and well-presented
- Graph 3 (methodological flowchart) adds limited value and could be omitted
- Graph 4 (bilingual indigenous schools by region) and Graph 5 (structuring axes) present synthesized information, but the sources and methodology for creating these figures require clarification
- The repeated explanatory text blocks accompanying each graph create redundancy

Required action:
- Clarify the basis for all figures: are they based on actual data, author's synthesis, or simulated/illustrative data? (Graph 4 notes "simulated data" – this needs explanation)
- Integrate figure discussions into the main text rather than adding redundant explanatory paragraphs
- Ensure all figures are properly labeled and cited

5. Repetitive Text and Incomplete Editing

The most significant concern is the presence of nearly identical text blocks repeated throughout the manuscript (pages 4, 7, 9, 10-11). For example:

"The study of indigenous linguistic diversity in Brazil highlights a significant concentration of over 110 distinct languages in the North region..."

This passage appears multiple times with minor variations, suggesting the manuscript is in draft form with multiple versions of similar content retained. This substantially undermines the professional presentation and suggests the manuscript is not yet ready for publication.

Required action:
- Remove all duplicate and repetitive passages
- Ensure each section contributes unique content to the overall argument
- Conduct a thorough revision to eliminate redundancy

Minor Concerns

6. Citation and Referencing
- In-text citations inconsistently include page numbers (sometimes present, sometimes absent)
- The reference list is appropriately structured but some citations in text may not appear in references (verification needed)
- Consider whether all references are necessary or if the list could be focused

7. Graph and Table Quality
- Graph 2 (theoretical references table) contains typographical errors (e.g., "Skutnabk-Kangas," "Barollos" instead of Barcelos, "divisos linguistas" appears incorrect)
- Some graphs lack clear titles or source attributions
- The formatting of tables could be improved for professional presentation

8. Language and Writing Quality
- The manuscript would benefit from proofreading for typographical errors and consistency
- Some sentences are lengthy and could be broken for clarity

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- The repeated explanatory paragraphs suggest the need for tighter editing

9. Discussion Depth

While the discussion (pages 7-9) addresses key themes, it could be strengthened by:

- More direct engagement with the theoretical framework in interpreting findings
- Deeper analysis of the tensions between legislative progress and practical implementation
- More specific examples of "successful practices" rather than general references
- Critical examination of why disparities between regions persist

10. Conclusion

The conclusion appropriately synthesizes main arguments but could:

- Offer more specific, actionable recommendations
- Acknowledge limitations of the study more explicitly
- Suggest directions for future research

Specific Technical Comments

1. **Abstract:** Clear and well-structured, accurately representing the manuscript's scope.
2. **Introduction (pages 1-2):** Effectively establishes the significance of the topic and provides relevant context. Graph 1 is helpful. The integration of citations is appropriate.
3. **Theoretical Framework (pages 2-4):** Strong selection of theorists. Graph 2 is useful but contains typographical errors that must be corrected.
4. **Methodology (pages 4-7):** The five-stage approach is logical, but the redundancy with the earlier methodology description must be resolved. The ethical considerations statement is appropriate.
5. **Analysis and Discussion (pages 7-9):** Engages with key themes but could be more deeply analytical. Graph 4's "simulated data" requires explanation.
6. **Final Considerations (pages 9-11):** Appropriate synthesis. Graph 5 is useful but its construction should be clarified. The repeated text blocks must be removed.
7. **References (pages 11-12):** Appropriate in scope and format