

Double-blind Peer Review evaluation process

1. The Editors will carry out a preliminary assessment of the contributions received. In cases of non-compliance with the style and editorial requirements, the Editor will invite the authors to send appropriate revised text.
2. If the articles submitted are outside the scope and the topic of the journal, or if the article does not meet basic standards of research quality, language and research ethics, the , the Editor will desk reject the article.
3. Contributions that have successfully passed the editorial review will be sent to *Double-blind Peer Review*.
4. The Editor will select two referees based on: (i) degree of knowledge of the topics involved in the contribution to be evaluated; (ii) knowledge of the language in which the article is written; (iii) time availability to review the paper; (iv) absence of conflicts of interest.
5. The review process is *Double-blind Peer Review*, that is, the author will be unknown to the reviewers, and vice versa. It is responsibility of the authors to ensure that the submission is blind such that title page containing author's information is separate from the main body of the manuscript, and the article is fully anonymized (there is no information that can reveal the author's identity within the body of the manuscript). The two referees will examine the contribution and will be asked to complete a review reference sheet and send it to the Editor within 30 days.
6. Each referee may opt for one of the following alternatives:
 - a. acceptance without the need for revisions:
 - b. acceptance subject to minor revisions:
 - c. invitation to review and re-send with major revisions
 - d. rejection of the contribution
7. The reference sheet also includes a comment note from the referee in which the referee must briefly explain the reasons for the judgment made.
8. The Editor will read the reviewers' comments and take a decision based on the Editor's own reading of the article and the reviewers' feedback. The decision can be one of three possibilities: Rejected, Accepted as is without changes, Conditionally accepted with modifications. If the changes are substantial, the manuscript might go through other iterative rounds of peer-review following re-submission, if possible with the original reviewers. If the changes are minor, the Editor will take the decision about the publication of the article. The authors must resubmit the reviewed article with changes highlighted or in track-changes, and a page where they provide a detailed response to each of the reviewers' and editor's comments.