

# Review of: "Environmental Representations in Rocky Records in National Parks in Southeastern Piauí – Brazil"

Silvina Rodríguez Curletto

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The proposed focus on the study of rock art in national parks in the southeast of Piauí, Brazil, is very important. However, it is worth noting some aspects that could be modified to improve the content of the article.

The proposed objectives are very interesting, but they are not achieved in the development of the work.

I suggest to add actualized antecedents of previous investigations of the region, and in particular contextual aspects of the sites that allow a better chronological and sociocultural location of the rock art and the landscapes studied.

In the theoretical approach, I suggest to review the use of concepts that may be contradictory between structuralist and post-structuralist frameworks. On the other hand, several of the theoretical aspects presented are not taken up again in the development of the work and it is not clear what is their link to the problem raised.

About materials and methods: I suggest to present the materials worked in an orderly manner, as well as to explain the analysis methodology used for the study of rock art. Specify which are the parameters, variables and analysis criteria that have been considered for each site. This will also allow the results achieved to be presented in a more orderly manner.

About the results: I suggest improving the technical, stylistic and landscape descriptions of each of the sites studied. For example: detail the location, quantity and characteristics of the rock art panels; the quantities and manufacturing techniques of the different motifs on each panel (types of paintings and engravings); its stylistic characteristics, synchrony and diachrony (relative chronologies) and its regional and chronological stylistic relationships that allow spatial and temporal contextualization of the information presented by the authors.

In general, further development of the interpretations, discussion and conclusions is required:

It is necessary to better base the interpretations that are made on the motifs (phytomorphic, anthropomorphic, zoomorphic, etc.) in relation to the possible uses, meanings and the importance of these manifestations in the communities that made them, since many proposals are not supported on the data presented in the article. It is suggested to coherently argue the extrapolations made between material referents and his possible meanings, as well as the paleoecological inferences that are made about some motifs that do not have a detailed analysis or an absolute dating that supports said proposal. It is also not clear what are the links or differences between the rock art, landscapes and archaeological contexts of the two studied areas.

I suggest to redraft the section "The indigenous people: environment and rock art", since it is not clear what the

information contained therein points to, nor what is the relationship with the rest of the article.

About the figures: I suggest to incorporate rock art photographs with an IFRAO scale, since a large percentage of them do not have this resource. It is also suggested to add images with digital processing that allow highlighting the details of the figures that the authors refer to.

About the bibliographic references: It is necessary to complete the citations correctly and unify citation norms.

Finally, as other reviewers have mentioned, it is necessary to review the wording in general and the English translation.