

## Norms for submitting the papers and for the peer reviewers

### 1. Editorial Board

All the articles and notes have to be submitted to the Editorial Board for publication. After they have been preliminarily accepted by the Director, the major articles (i.e., those for the sections "Articoli" and "Dissertazioni") are sent to the Scientific Committee (SC), that also acts as the main peer review group.

The contributions to the other sections ("Mondofoto", "In altre lingue", "Recensioni", "Segnalazioni", "Documenti", "Relazioni") are directly approved by the Director.

### 2. Scientific Committee and Referees

The members of the SC of *Ethnorêma* also act as peer reviewers. The papers that have to be assessed are sent to them according to their specific competences.

The SC will also ask for the help of external referees, whenever this will be deemed to be useful.

The referees' assessments will be made with the so-called *double blind* method: both the referee's and the author's names will remain strictly confidential.

All the referees to whom the papers are submitted (as Word \*.doc or \*.docx documents, or as pdf ones) are kindly requested to do the following:

1. Read accurately the whole paper and highlight any comment, suggestion, request of change in yellow and in notes on the margins or at the end of the paragraph. If the notes are made on a Word document, please add also a pdf version, taking care that any special characters can be viewed also on a different computer.
2. Fill in all the sections of the enclosed peer-review form.
3. Send the peer review form and the paper with their comments to the Director (at the address [moreno.vergari@ethnorema.it](mailto:moreno.vergari@ethnorema.it)) within 30 days, in both Word and pdf formats.

All comments and suggestions made by the referees will be sent to the contribution's author by the Director, specifying that it has been made by an expert in the subject-matter dealt with in the contribution.

## Peer-Review Form

ARTICLE TITLE:

REVIEWED BY:

RECEIVED ON:

RETURNED ON:

### A) THEORY

*How would you rate this article's theoretical soundness?*

1 – Poor     2 – Fair     3 – Average     4 – Good     5 – Excellent

Comments to editors regarding theory

Suggestions to author/s regarding theory

### B) METHODOLOGY

*How would you rate this article's methodological rigor in presenting its empirical research?*

N/A – Not Applicable (the article is a theoretical article with no empirical components)  
 1 – Poor     2 – Fair     3 – Average     4 – Good     5 – Excellent

Comments to editors regarding methodology

Suggestions to author/s regarding methodology

### C) WRITING

*How would you rate this article's standard of academic writing?*

1 – Poor     2 – Fair     3 – Average     4 – Good     5 – Excellent

Comments to editors regarding writing

Suggestions to author/s regarding writing

## D) RELEVANCE

*How would you rate this article's relevance to its field of studies?*

1 – Not Relevant    2 – Somewhat Relevant    3 – Relevant    4 – Very relevant

Comments to editors regarding relevance

Suggestions to author/s regarding relevance

## E) GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF ARTICLE

- Accept as it is
- Accept with minor changes as suggested in this form without further review
- Return to author for changes and subsequently resubmit for further review
- Decline

General comments to editors regarding article

General suggestions to author/s regarding article