

Scientific Editor's Evaluation

Once at least two ad hoc reviews have been received, the Scientific Editor:

- Evaluates the manuscript regarding the originality of the research and the results presented in relation to what has already been published in the RBGG and in the field of study; observes the study's contribution to geriatric and gerontological knowledge and practice;
- Assesses the coherence between the title, introduction, objective, study design, population, variables, data collection and analysis methodology, and results; evaluates the appropriate use of gerontological and epidemiological concepts;
- Assesses whether the results are presented objectively and clearly to the reader; verifies the report on compliance with ethical issues;
- Evaluates, in the discussion of results, whether they have been substantiated and their relevance is highlighted (for knowledge and/or practice in the field of geriatrics and gerontology); also assesses whether the study limitations were discussed and whether the conclusions address the study objective; and quantitatively evaluates the timeliness of the references used.
- Reads the ad hoc reviews; observes the reviewers' recommendations, especially the conceptual specificities of the area or topic and methodological aspects.
- Reads the comments made on the preprint of the manuscript under evaluation.

Based on the reviewers' (specialists in the area) assessment of the work's innovation and relevance, and their recommendation for acceptance or rejection, the scientific editor prepares a single review, unifying the reviewers' comments.

The Scientific Editor recommends publishing the article, conditions publication upon revisions, or does not recommend publication of the article. Furthermore, they verify the adequacy of the revisions recommended in the final opinion during the revision stages and check for plagiarism in the manuscript. Reviewers who make themselves available may be invited to re-evaluate the manuscript after revisions by the authors.

This process is in accordance with the Scielo guidelines (Criteria, policy and procedures for the admission and permanence of scientific journals in the SciELO Brazil Collection, 2017) and with COPE (A Short Guide to Ethical Editing for New Editors; How to recognize potential manipulation of the peer review process).