

## Summary of Findings and Conclusions (Peer Review Report)

The manuscript is a mature and carefully crafted historiographical essay on the incorporation of gender as an analytical category in studies of Republican Brazil (1889–1989). It combines a solid theoretical framework with a detailed mapping of Brazilian historical scholarship, and reads as the work of an author entirely at ease both with the international gender studies canon and with the specificities of Brazilian intellectual and political history.

Substantively, the text traces how gender moved from a marginal or absent concern in class-centred and state-centred interpretations to a structuring lens through which citizenship, labour relations, political violence and democratisation are re-read. It shows, in particular, the decisive role of feminist theory (Beauvoir, Rubin, Scott, Butler) and its Brazilian reception; the transition from “women’s history” to “gender history”; and the subsequent expansion to intersectional approaches, especially via Black Brazilian feminism (Lélia Gonzalez, Sueli Carneiro) and studies of masculinities (Connell and others). The periodisation across the First Republic, the Vargas era, the 1945–1964 interval, the military dictatorship and the re-democratisation period offers a clear narrative skeleton for non-specialist readers.

In terms of contribution, the article’s main value lies in its synthetic and clarifying function: it gathers dispersed debates, canonical works and key shifts in emphasis into a single coherent architecture. Rather than merely listing authors, it suggests an underlying movement from structuralist, class-based and often androcentric accounts towards a more refined understanding of gendered subjectivities, micropolitics and intersecting hierarchies of race, class and region. For an “average” academic periodical in history or gender studies, this is more than sufficient originality: the text renders a complex field intelligible and demonstrates convincingly that gender is not an optional supplement but a constitutive grammar of Brazilian republican experience.

My overall evaluation is therefore positive. I recommended **acceptance with minor revisions**. The revisions proposed are not meant to alter the core argument but to sharpen its profile for editors and readers:

1. Clarify explicitly in the introduction that the article is a **critical historiographical review**, rather than a primary-source-driven empirical study, and briefly state the criteria for the selection of works.
2. Formulate the central claim in a compact, quotable paragraph in the introduction, and echo it in the conclusion, emphasising that gender reconfigures, rather than merely enriches, standard narratives of the Brazilian Republic.
3. Insert a short synthetic passage that explicitly maps the main historiographical shifts within Brazilian gender history (from class-centred to agency-centred, from “women” to “gender”, and then to intersectional and queer perspectives).
4. Offer a brief justification of the temporal cut at 1889–1989, indicating that post-1990 developments constitute a distinct phase that lies beyond the scope of the present article.
5. Align references and minor stylistic details with the target journal’s style guide, and, where desired, slightly shorten a handful of particularly long sentences.

Once these modest adjustments are made, the manuscript is clearly publishable and, in fact, stands somewhat above what one would ordinarily expect from an “average” periodical in the field.