Paper: **"Arte Sonoro y Metaverso"**

Corresponding Author: Melina Gabriela Ricca Cornaglia

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Marco Tulio Ceron Lopez
Popular Autonomous University of the State of Puebla, Mexico

Reviewer 2: Sandrina Diniz Fernandes Milhano
Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, CI & DEI, High School of Education and Social Sciences, Portugal

----
Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title "Arte sonoro y metaverso" is clear, concise, and appropriate. It accurately reflects the thematic focus of the article and aligns well with its content, which explores the theoretical framework of sound art within virtual environments such as the metaverse.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract is well written and provides a general overview of the theoretical approach. However, it lacks a clearly stated objective, method, and specific results. I recommended restructuring the abstract to clearly present objectives, methods, and results.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Overall, the article is well written. Nevertheless, there are a few minor grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the text. I suggest avoiding excessively long sentences, as they may affect the reading flow. There are minor punctuation, agreement, and typing errors. Examples: "asi como también" → should read "así como también"; or "estas ppracticas".
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
I suggest including a brief section outlining the conceptual or methodological framework to clarify the study methods. This approach resembles a theoretical-reflective essay, as explained in the abstract. Therefore, it is important to briefly explain the methodological approach used, such as whether it is a theoretical essay, literature review, or critical framework, which guided the selection and analysis of sources.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The body of the paper is clear and well structured, and the argumentative flow is coherent and does not contain errors. It is conceptually dense and rich in references.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion in the final section—titled "elucubraciones y conclusiones inconclusas"— contains relevant reflections supported by the content. A brief synthesis at the end of this section with a summary of the paper's main contributions and future research directions would provide a more explicit and accurate concluding summary.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The reference list is extensive, comprehensive, up-to-date, and appropriate.
Two in-text citations need to be included in the list of references: Ramos Torres (2016) cited in the section "Posibles desenlaces: elucubraciones y conclusiones inconclusas" and Deleuze & Guattari (1980) cited in the context of the "rizoma". The references of Benjamin (2003) need correct page numbers.
The in-text citation of Arendt, H. (2008) could be clarified as different works, for instance, by adding full titles in-text to avoid confusion.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The title "Arte sonoro y metaverso" is clear, concise, and appropriate. The text is theoretically well framed, with an extensive, comprehensive, up-to-date, and appropriate reference list.
In line with the comments provided in each topic, I suggest clarifying the study methods by adding a short section explicitly stating the analytical framework. It would help readers better understand the structure and scope of the work. Suggestions include restructuring the abstract to briefly outline the aim, method, and key insights in a more standard academic format.
Throughout the text, there are a few minor grammatical issues to correct. In addition, shortening some long sentences would improve readability.
The concluding section is reflective, engaging, and supported by the content. However, it would benefit from a more concise summary of the article's main contributions and potential directions for future research. A few sources cited in the text are missing from the reference list (e.g., Ramos Torres, 2016; Deleuze & Guattari, 1980), and at least one reference is incomplete (Benjamin, 2003).

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Si, es claro y adecuado.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
El resumen es claro y especifica los puntos requeridos.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
No hay errores.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Si es claro el método
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
El cuero del artículo es claro
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
Tienen una conclusión clara y con argumentos sólidos
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Referencias coherentes al tema
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Muy buen trabajo de revisión literaria sobre el tema.