

## Guidelines for Reviewers

1.	Acknowledgement Note . . . . .	1
2.	The Invitation . . . . .	1
2.1	Suitability of the topic . . . . .	1
2.2	Deadline for Review Submission . . . . .	1
2.3	Conflict of Interest . . . . .	2
3.	The Review . . . . .	2
4.	The Review Form . . . . .	2
4.1	Originality . . . . .	2
4.2	Scientific Soundness . . . . .	2
4.3	Interest to the Readers . . . . .	3
4.4	Clarity of Presentation . . . . .	3
4.5	English Language Level . . . . .	3
5.	Recommendation . . . . .	3
6.	Fraud and Plagiarism . . . . .	3
7.	Submitting the review . . . . .	3

### 1. Acknowledgement Note

Thank you for supporting Librello as a reviewer. Your generous contribution will help us to maintain high standards in our peer review process and publishing the most relevant research.

### 2. The Invitation

#### 2.1 *Suitability of the topic*

The editor who has selected you for the review may not be overly familiar with your work, and may not have a precise idea of your speciality. Please read the abstract of the submission referred to you and only accept the review if its topic does match your expertise.

#### 2.2 *Deadline for Review Submission*

A high quality review is time consuming. The time necessary to review a manuscript properly varies according to the subject, but is on average half a working day. We believe that a timely submission of the report is important to the review process and we usually grant the reviewers 2–3 weeks to submit their report from the moment of their acceptance. We, therefore ask that reviewers to try to keep to our deadlines or inform our editors should they require more time.

## 2.3 Conflict of Interest

Please inform us of any conflict of interest you may have with the topic or the authors of the manuscript. Conflicts of interest do not preclude the possibility of you reviewing the manuscript, particularly if you can show that you are able to make a neutral review. However, it is important that you inform us of the conflict of interest and of its nature for us to take it into account while considering the submission.

## 3. The Review

We have opted for a single-blinded review system, where the identity of the authors is revealed to the reviewers once they accept the invitation, but not otherwise. By knowing the identity of the authors, the reviewer can more easily identify a conflict of interest or access previous publication of the author to get to know his/her work.

The submitted manuscript is a confidential document and should not be disclosed to third parties. In the case the reviewer feels he/she should consult a colleague, he/she must obtain permission from the responsible editor beforehand. Our editors are usually accommodating in these cases, as additional comments contribute to the quality of the review.

The reviewer is discouraged from using the review process to showcase his/her own work and publications. A modest number of recommendations of additional specific literature are welcome, as long as these are appropriate to the scope of the submission. The reviewer should support his/her evaluation of the manuscript with consistent examples or appropriate justification. Criticism should not be superficial, and recommendations of rejections must be accordingly justified. Furthermore, the reviewer should make specific and clear recommendations for the improvement of the submission. Finally, the review report should be written in a collegiate and constructive form, the aim of the peer review process is to increase and accelerate the progress of science and we therefore encourage the reviewer to collaborate to the increment and control of the quality of each submission.

To help the reviewers on evaluating specific aspects of the manuscript, we provide a standard review form. The aspects we expect to be evaluated are cited and described in the following section.

## 4. The Review Form

The review form helps the reviewer when evaluating the manuscript. The reviewer should complete the review form and return it to the editor using the submission system. Alternatively, the reviewer is welcome to upload a text document containing the review. Should the reviewer decide on the latter, he/she must still refer to the topics below in the report.

### 4.1 Originality

Is the research or approach of this manuscript original?  
Does the manuscript make a valuable contribution to the field?

### 4.2 Scientific Soundness

Does the title represent the aim of the main findings of the manuscript?  
Does the abstract outline the methods, state the hypotheses or objectives and summarize the results?  
Are the methods described accurately enough to allow the reproduction of results?  
Are the statistic methods described in enough detail?  
Are the results well structured and described?  
Are the results compared with appropriate and current literature in the discussion?  
Are the conclusions supported by the results?

### 4.3 Interest to the Readers

Does the introduction consist of an extensive and deep assessment of the current literature?  
Would the manuscript be appealing to scholars in the same field or non-academics interested in the topic?

### 4.4 Clarity of Presentation

Does the text follow a logical order? Are the ideas clearly developed?  
Are the visual resources (graphics and figures) useful and sufficient to the understanding of the reader?

### 4.5 English Language Level

Does the English level meet the standards of international scientific publications?  
Is the language comprehensive?

## 5. Recommendation

After a thorough assessment of the quality of the manuscript, the reviewer should make a recommendation on the next step for the submission, addressed to the Editor-in-Chief of the journal.

- *Accept submission* – The manuscript is ready for publication.
- *Revisions Required* – Minor revisions are required, but the manuscript is to be accepted if these changes are undertaken by the author.
- *Resubmit to Review* – Major changes are needed. After resubmission, the Editor-in-Chief should decide if the manuscript needs to be reviewed again. The reviewer that gives this recommendation should make clear his/her availability to review the revised version. Note that the reviewer's availability in the second round is important to the consistency of the review.
- *Decline Submission* – The manuscript should be rejected. The reviewer should explain the reason of this recommendation, e.g., unsuitability for the journal, the manuscript is not original, the suggested improvements are so extensive they would require a new submission, etc.

## 6. Fraud and Plagiarism

Cases of fraud are difficult to identify. However, if the reviewer suspects data manipulation, believes that the submission's data within are untrue or that much of its text has previously been published, we kindly ask that he/she contact us, giving as much detail as possible on the source of the plagiarism.

## 7. Submitting the review

To submit the review, please log in to your account on our website. If you have already accepted the review, there will be an active review in your user home and clicking on the active manuscript will take you to the review page. Please complete the review form or, alternatively, upload a file containing your review report. Finally, select your recommendation and send your review to the editor in charge by clicking the respective button.