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**Peer-Reviewing procedure guidelines**

The peer-review process is an independent procedure to assess and control the quality of the articles submitted to our Journal. As in most scientific Journals, in our Journal as well this procedure shows that the Scientific Director, the Editor in Chief, the Editorial board, the Scientific Committee and all the members involved in the reviewing process have done everything possible to ensure that an article has relevance, reliability, scientific value and ethical correctness, and that it is written in a way that meets the journal’s aims, scopes and standards, and the needs of readers.

The quality of the process is crucial for the final standard of the Journal and it is important that the Editor is in control of the whole process and drives the reviewers in formalizing their evaluations, encouraging them to express constructive critical points of view. However, excessively severe and / or caustic comments that are not accompanied by suggestions aimed to improve the article should be avoided. In his / her evaluation the reviewer must be thorough and provide as much details as possible. Extremely brief reviews are not helpful in improving an article. As a matter of fact, no author will reasonably be able to review and modify properly his/her/their essay without a precise idea of what the article needs to be improved in. To consistently outline their opinions, the reviewer must follow the parameters listed in sections 1 and 2. Field 3 and 4 are left open for more detailed and argued comment.

**1 – Overall evaluation of the article (fill-in with X)**

**Recommendations for Reviewers**

*The following questions do not substitute for specific comments made for authors. Please give further details in the comments for authors box below (n. 3)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **4 – Excellently** | **3 – Fairly** | **2 - Sufficiently** | **1 – Poorly** | **0 -No/I don’t feel skilled to evaluate this field** |
| *Does the article follow the general guidelines and topics of the Journal?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Does the article contribute in an innovative way to the development of knowledge in the field?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Are the arguments consistent with each other and adequately developed?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Is the topic discussed in a clear and communicative way?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Are the methodology and analysis techniques appropriate for the topic of reference?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Are there any suggestions and proposals for future research?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Are the shortcomings of the research adequately covered?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Are the conclusions convincing?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Does the article properly cite the works already published in the scientific community?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Is the article edited according to the editorial rules /standards of the Journal?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Did you detect plagiarism?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Is the article edited in a good English, with clear phrasing in the text for the benefit of editors, reviewers, and readers?* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Did you detect inappropriate self-citations by authors?* |  |  |  |  |  |

**2 - On the publication of the article**

[fill-in with X in the box]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Article publishable without any revisions |  |
| Article publishable after revision |  |
| Article published after deep revisions and after a second round of review |  |
| Non-publishable article |  |

**3 - Further comments and observations for the Author/s**

**4 - Comments for Editors (will not be revealed to Author/s)**