

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 identity of the author of the article they are reviewing, and the author will not know the names of his/her referees. Only the Management of the Journal and the Editorial Board will know both identities, and they pledge not to reveal them under any circumstance. To ensure full transparency, a list of all the referees who cooperated in the review process for issues from one particular year or more will be made public at a later date. Referees will, in their turn, pledge to maintain confidentiality even if, after the paper they reviewed for GdM has been published, they are able to identify the author.

However, the names of all the referees who have reviewed articles over a two-year period will be listed at the end of the final issue of the second year.

2. The Management of the Journal will forward each paper submitted for publication and considered of interest and falling within the scientific-cultural aims and scope of the Journal to two anonymous referees; these are normally experts in the field who are not members of the Editorial Board or Scientific Committee of the Journal. The paper must be sent either in hardcopy or as an e-mail attachment, after the author's name and all possible references to his/her identity (including works cited in the sources) have been removed. The Management of the Journal 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 will be composed of three parts: in the first one, referees must express a positive or negative evaluation based on the following criteria:

- A. The topic is of interest, within the scientific-cultural guidelines of the Journal
- B. The paper is original, or otherwise relevant
- C. The paper is characterized by solid and well-developed argumentation and discussion, independently from the fact that they can be shared or not.
- D. It offers a review of the literature, presents the historic development of concepts, takes into consideration various points of view, even when they are different from or in conflict with the author's, it is up to date with recent research.
- E. The paper is syntactically and grammatically sound, flowing, easily understandable and enjoyable to read.

In the second part, referees will write free comments, in a discursive form, providing reasons for their judgments and/or describing possible suggested changes, if they think the paper can be published in a revised version. In the third and last part, referees will express a final judgement, choosing from the following four options:

The paper under review is

- A. Publishable in its current form, or with minor revisions.
- B. Potentially publishable in a new version which takes into account the suggested modifications, but will nonetheless be resubmitted to the peer review procedure.
- C. Not acceptable.

Within a pre-established timeframe, the judgment expressed according to these guidelines will be communicated by e-mail attachment (preferably in PDF version) to the Editorial Board. Even in the case of a type A judgement, the author will have to consider eventual criticism and modification

proposals suggested by the reviewers and will make the editing modifications, as requested by either the reviewers or the Editorial Board.

4. The above communication might be omitted, if the Management considers it appropriate, in the case of a unanimous conclusion of the types A or D, although as a rule, the peer review process implies a thorough communication of its result to the authors. Scholars providing reviews should be particularly sensitive to this aspect. They will accordingly choose the most appropriate form of expression when commenting upon the problematical aspects of the texts under evaluation and when motivating their final decision as to whether they are suitable for publication, provided that the substance behind a decision is preserved.

5. The opinions expressed by the referees are binding for the Management and Editorial Board. Articles that have received a final type A judgement from both the reviewers will be accepted and published as soon as the programming of the Journal issues permits. When there is a difference of opinion the Management will request a review from a third external referee, to be produced following the above-described procedure. In any case, only articles receiving a positive judgement from two referees will be accepted.

6. The peer review procedure must be completed and the substantiated judgements of the referees communicated to the author within four months after the author has been informed that his/her proposed article has been accepted and that it has been forwarded for the peer review procedure. If the article should be accepted for publication the Management will inform the author immediately or within a maximum of 15 days as to the date and modalities of publication.