



Review A of Perspectives of information design in
the use of simple language in women's health
articles on Wikipedia

<https://doi.org/10.1590/1808-5245.32.147969A>

Reviewed article: MACENA, Isabela Correa; JORENTE, Maria José Vicentini. Perspectives of information design in the use of simple language in women's health articles on Wikipedia. **Em Questão**, Porto Alegre, v. 32, e-147969, 2026. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1808-5245.32.147969>

REVIEW

Completed on: 2025-10-28 21:26 PM

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

1. Adequacy to the editorial profile of Em Questão: *

Bad

2. Relevance of the topic: *

Good

3. Originality in approaching the topic: *

Bad

4. Contribution to Information Science: *

Good

5. Remarks regarding relevance, originality and contribution to the area of knowledge:

The manuscript Perspectives of Information Design in the use of Simple Language in Women's Health Articles on Wikipedia addresses a subject of evident public and scholarly significance. By situating its inquiry at the intersection of Information Design, plain language practices, and women's health, it demonstrates awareness of contemporary transformations in the mediation of information and knowledge. The decision to examine Wikipedia as a corpus acknowledges the epistemic and social implications of open, collaboratively produced information environments. Also, the comparative perspective between the English and Simple English versions reveals a concern with the relationship between linguistic accessibility and informational structure, an approach that, if conceptually refined, could yield valuable contributions for both communication theory and health-literacy research.

6. Quality and appropriateness of the theoretical framework:*

Bad

7. Remarks regarding quality and appropriateness of the theoretical framework:

In the Introduction, the argumentation lacks central concern. The author transitions abruptly between distinct topics, Information Design, Simple English, Wikipedia, Natural Language Processing, and women's health information, without establishing the analytical relationships among them. The absence of an organizing rationale makes it difficult to discern the intellectual motivation of the study or the relevance of its chosen objects. The reader is not informed about the origin or significance of the concern with access to women's health information.

The manuscript includes an unsubstantiated assertion that

“the accessibility of content on women's health on Wikipedia is a decisive factor in expanding equitable access to knowledge.”

Such a statement requires empirical or theoretical grounding in previous literature. Without citation or argumentation, it remains a subjective assumption.

By omitting a discussion of current research on information design in health communication and on the accessibility of women's health information online, the article remains disconnected from established research traditions and engages only superficially with contemporary academic debates. In the Introduction, the argumentation lacks central concern. The author transitions abruptly between distinct topics, Information Design, Simple English, Wikipedia, Natural Language Processing, and women's health information, without establishing the analytical relationships among them. The absence of an organizing rationale makes it difficult to discern the intellectual motivation of the study or the relevance of its chosen objects. The reader is not informed about the origin or significance of the concern with access to women's health information.

The manuscript includes an unsubstantiated assertion that "the accessibility of content on women's health on Wikipedia is a decisive factor in expanding equitable access to knowledge."

Such a statement requires empirical or theoretical grounding in previous literature. Without citation or argumentation, it remains a subjective assumption.

By omitting a discussion of current research on information design in health communication and on the accessibility of women's health information online, the article remains disconnected from established research traditions and engages only superficially with contemporary academic debates.

8. Relevance and adequacy of methodological procedures:*

Good

9. Clarity in presenting and detailing methodological procedures: *

Good

10. Remarks regarding methodological procedures:

The analysis of the research development process lacks methodological transparency and interpretive depth. The description of comparative procedures, between English and Simple English articles, is detailed at the operational level but not analytically justified. Although the reader can follow the procedures described, the reasoning behind those choices and their analytical relevance to information design in health communication are insufficiently developed. The study requires a stronger alignment between its methodological criteria and interpretive aims in order to move beyond a descriptive account of observations and become a substantive, conceptually grounded contribution to the field.

11. Rationality and discussion of results and coherence of conclusions: *

Bad

12. Remarks regarding the results and conclusions.

The discussion of Wikipedia's history is presented in a cursory and largely descriptive manner. The text reiterates the platform's origins, collaborative structure, and numerical growth without offering a critical perspective on how these developments relate to the study's objectives. Merely citing the year of its creation and the number of articles provides historical background but not analytical value. The section could have examined how the evolution of Wikipedia's editorial practices, governance structures, or information policies might shape the accessibility of health-related content. In its current form, this contextualization functions as an introduction to the platform rather than an inquiry into its epistemological or communicative significance.

The section on women's health enumerates topics such as physical, mental, and public health and presents quantitative data on the corresponding articles, however the discussion remains confined to classification rather than analysis.

The text reports the existence of entries and differences between the English and Simple English versions but does not examine what these variations suggest about the representation or framing of women's health on Wikipedia. Without a critical interpretation of how information on women's bodies, conditions, or vulnerabilities is constructed, the analysis remains purely observational, missing the opportunity to address broader epistemic or communicative implications of this content.

In the Final Considerations, the text restates general observations, such as the prominence of Wikipedia and the potential usefulness of Simple English, without linking these points to the analysis conducted. The text does not emerge logically from the evidence presented in the preceding sections, which weakens the manuscript's argumentative coherence.

13. Quality of argumentation (clarity, conciseness, objectivity), textual correction and text structure.*

Bad

14. Remarks regarding the language and writing of the text:

The Abstract opens with a general statement that no longer offers analytical relevance:

"The transformations driven by Information and Communication Technologies have established digital-virtual environments as essential resources for access to and dissemination of health-related information."

The formulation repeats an already established premise and does not specify any particular problem or gap in existing knowledge.

The abstract fails to indicate key contextual details, namely, the time frame of the analysis and the extent of the corpus, which leaves the methodological parameters only partially defined.

The manuscript requires substantial enhancement in language and style, as it currently reveals significant structural and lexical inconsistencies that undermine its overall coherence. The frequent repetition of vocabulary, uneven sentence construction, and overly literal phrasing reflect a limited grasp of

academic writing conventions in English. These issues detract from the manuscript's rhetorical and conceptual effectiveness.

The statement of objectives does not conform to standard editorial guidelines. It enumerates procedural steps rather than articulating a research purpose or hypothesis that could guide interpretation.

15. What is your recommendation on accepting the article?*

Accept it with corrections (specify below).

16. Specify the suggested changes and/or justify the non-acceptance.*

Accept it with corrections.

Recommendation: RESUBMIT FOR REVIEW

