

Giornale di Metafisica

Peer Review Guidelines

1. Referees will always review papers in a double-blind process. This means that referees will not know the author of the article they are reviewing, and the author will not know the names of his referees. Only the Editorial Board will know both names, and they pledge not to reveal them under any circumstance. To ensure full transparency, a list of all the referees who cooperated to the review process for issues from one particular year or more will be made public later. Referees will, in their turn, pledge to discretion even in the case in which, after the paper they reviewed for GdM has been published, they will be able to identify the author.
2. The Editorial Board will forward each paper submitted for publication to two anonymous referees. The paper will be sent either in hardcopy or as an e-mail attachment, after removing the author's name and all possible references to his identity (including his works cited in the sources). The Editorial Board will, in this case, create two files for the same paper. The file with no reference to the author will be sent to the referees, while the other will remain at the disposal of the Editorial Board and will be used in case of acceptance.
3. The referees' evaluation is composed of three parts: in the first one, referees will grade the paper (on a scale from 1 to 5) with respect to the following criteria, listed from A to F:
 - A. The topic is of interest for the scientific-cultural guidelines of the Journal
 - B. The paper is original or, however, relevant
 - C. The paper is characterized by solid and well developed argumentations, independently from the fact that they might be shared by the referee
 - D. It offers a lit review, it is aware of the historic development of concepts, takes into consideration different points of view, also when different from the author's ones, it is up to date as far as recent research is concerned.
 - E. The paper is syntactically and grammatically sound, flowing, easily understandable and enjoyable to read.

In second part, referees will write free comments, providing reasons for their judgment and/or describing possible changes they suggest, if they think the paper can be published in a revised version; in the third and last part, referee will express a final judgement, choosing between the following four options:

The paper under review is

- A. Acceptable in the current form, or with minor revisions
 - B. Acceptable with revisions
 - C. Possibly acceptable in a revised new version that takes the suggested revisions into consideration, but after a new round of peer review.
 - D. Not acceptable.
4. Within a pre-established timeframe, the judgment expressed according to this framework will be forwarded by e-mail attachment (preferably in PDF version) to the Editorial Board. The Editorial Board will then forward it as it is to the author and, always

anonymously, to the other referee. The opinion expressed by the two referees is usually binding for the direction and the Editorial Board, who can, however, express their independent evaluation.

5. This communication might be omitted, if the Direction considers it appropriate, in case of an unanimous conclusion of the types A or D, yet the peer review process implies a thorough communication of its result to the authors. Scholars providing reviews should be particularly aware of the sensitiveness of this aspect. They will take this fact into due consideration when commenting upon the problems of the texts under evaluation and when motivating their final decision, provided that the essential content of such a decision is preserved.