Peer-review policy

The journal employs the **double-blind peer review** process, where both reviewers and authors remain anonymous throughout the review process. All research articles are submitted to two anonymous experts, usually not belonging to either the Editorial Staff or the International Advisory Board (90%). The reviewers are chosen preferably outside of the Department (80%).

Every proposal submitted for publication is read at least by an editor, for an initial review. If the paper agrees with editorial policies and with a minimum quality level, is sent to two reviewers. Reviewer selection for each article submitted is assigned to the Managing editors, who ask one or more of the Editors to provide a list of relevant academics with expertise in the field. The Managing Editor then chooses two reviewers from this list.

The reviewers won’t know the author's identity, as any identifying information will be stripped from the document before review. Reviewers' comments to the editors are confidential and before passing on to the author will made anonymous. The names of the reviewers remain strictly confidential, with their identities known only the Managing Editor, the Associate Editor and the Editor-in-chief.

Peer reviewers will have **four possible options** for each article

1. Accept without revision
2. Accept with minor amendments
3. Support publication with significant revisions and likely re-review
4. Reject

In cases where there is strong disagreement either among peer reviewers, further expert advice may be sought.

Based on the reviewers' comments, the Editorial Board makes a final decision on the acceptability of the manuscript, and communicates to the authors the decision, along with referees' reports.

**Whether significant revisions are proposed, acceptance is dependent on whether the author can deal with those satisfactorily.**

The purpose of the review is primarily to identify means of maximizing the potential of the paper. Peer reviewers are asked to consider the following:
- How might the paper make a more distinctive and effective contribution to the existing literature?
- In what ways might the paper be made to fit more clearly within, and address, the central theme of the issue?
- How might the coherence, cogency and clarity of the paper be improved?
- In what ways might contentious elements of the article be made subject to reasonable disagreement?

Peer reviewers are asked to say if the article is not sufficiently clearly written for publication. In such cases authors are asked to revise the article.
Confidentiality
Reviewers should treat the contents of the manuscript under review as strictly confidential, not to be disclosed. The reviewers' assessments will be sent to the authors, although the names of the evaluators will not be revealed.

The list of all referees (in alphabetical order and with no connection with the article reviewed) might be passed on to the commissions of the societies in charge of the scientific evaluation of the journals or published in compliance with the requirements of the relevant authorities. In no case the connection between the referees and the given article reviewed will be revealed.