

Review of: "Reforesting_now"

Beatriz Rodríguez-Labajos¹

1 University Pompeu Fabra

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I have accepted to review this article because I am curious about the possibilities of open review and publishing. The topic of the paper, which combines visual design and environmental activism, connects with my own research interests. I find the idea of modelling elements of an ecosystem under pressure based on historical archives promising for certain purposes of environmental communication.

That said, the text I read cannot be called a scientific paper. Other reviewers have pinpointed the issues with the structure of the paper (lack of sections about background, methods, discussion, and so on). It might be the case that the authors are not familiar with the role that each of these parts has in connecting their research interests with existing scholarship. With this, they are not only missing the opportunity of improving their own research process but also the relevance of their work for other researchers. For example, most of my current work is focused on creative environmentalism, but there is no way that I can refer to this initiative, which undoubtedly has some interesting elements, as I do not find it scientifically robust in the way how it is presented.

Beyond structure, some points that need to be clarified are 1) what is the objective or research question guiding the augmented reality project, 2) how is the idea and the implementation of the idea informed by other similar initiatives in the Brazilian / Latin American / International context or related ideas in existing scientific literature; 3) details on which methods did the authors follow for data gathering, data organization, and data analysis; 4) to what extend the authors considered their original research objective reached or what is the response to their original research question, vis-à-vis existing scientific progress on the topics they are addressing. This latter part requires engagement with existing scientific literature.

If the authors are genuinely interested in preparing a scientific article, I would be happy to provide more detailed pointers. My contact details are easy to find online. At this stage, though, I can only say that the limitations of open publishing without editorial monitoring are manifest. I hope the authors will understand that my review is not done without kindness, as I have spent time that for me is really valuable to provide feedback to a piece that, in my view, is not at state that should be reviewed yet.

Qeios ID: TT91UP · https://doi.org/10.32388/TT91UP