



## Peer review

All content published in the journal, except for the introduction to the number in question, presentation notes, announcements of the Editorial Board and articles written on invitation, are peer reviewed.

Any doubts authors may have about the journal's peer review process should be directed to the Editorial Board.

## Peer reviewers

Peer reviewers are selected based on their qualifications. In particular, account is taken to their merit of work, academic career (as researcher, teacher, tutor, jury member in post-graduation tests) and other factors, such as practice regarding deadlines.

Authors may request the appointment of a peer reviewer not listed in the journal, or the exclusion of one or more reviewers. In any case, the authors explain the reasons for this request.

The request shall be based on objective reasons demonstrating the possibility of a lack of exemption in the examination of the article, such as the existence of a conflict of interest.

The Editorial Board, however, reserves the power to decide on the request, and undertakes to justify its response, at least when it is not addressed.

The Board oversees the work of the peer reviewers in order to ensure the rigor of the selection of papers for publication. In extreme cases, the Board may replace one or more peer reviewers with a new.

## Report

The peer reviewers prepare a report for each paper presented and send it to the Editorial Board. This report may be based on a model evaluation form, as defined by the Editorial Board, which indicates the essential parameters of the evaluation.

When communicating its decision to the author, the Board shall also forward the report of the peer reviewers.

Peer reviewers should guide their opinion on the proposed work based on the following factors:

- Novelty and originality of the theme or its treatment;
- The quality of the arguments put forward to support the conclusions reached;
- Knowledge and analysis of the main national and foreign bibliography on the subject;
- Current topic and importance of work for jurists and practitioners of other areas of knowledge;
- Crossing with other areas of Law;
- Crossing with other areas of knowledge and culture, not only technical but also artistic;
- Clarity and correctness of writing.



This list is not exhaustive. In case relevance has been given to other factors, the reviewer must specify them in their report. The various factors will be subject to a differentiated consideration, according to their importance, the nature of the theme and the treatment that the author proposes to give to it. The quality of the argumentation and the knowledge and analysis of the most relevant bibliography on the subject are essential elements. Crossing with other areas, inside or outside the Law, will only be evaluated when it occurs – with its absence not being criticizable therefore not to criticize its absence (except when the very nature of the subject imposes it). Notwithstanding the assessing the relevance of work to other areas of knowledge, it must assume importance, first and foremost, for jurists. Reviewers have critical freedom in reporting. The Board does not modify the content of the reports, except in exceptional circumstances, e.g. if they contain insulting remarks to the authors. The Boards reserves the right to suppress comments of this type or other expressions which, contrary to objective criticism, may be considered inappropriate. The reviewers should also report in their report or separate communication to the Board a well-founded suspicion that the work submitted has been subject to usurpation and counterfeiting, or its exploitation in accordance with articles nrs. 195, 196 and 199 of the Copyright and Related Rights Code.

### **Subjection to the peer review process and final decision**

Papers proposed for publication are first read by one or more editors. They may reject the proposed material without sending it for review, whenever the lack of interest in the work or lack of compliance with the requirements to accept its publication is evident.

If there is no rejection, the work is sent to two peer reviewers.

After receiving the reviewers' report on the work, the Editorial Board makes one of four possible decisions:

- Accept publication of the work without changes;
- To invite the author to modify or to develop some point, or to add some;
- Important complement (for example, by suggesting to take into account a recent article on the subject), postponing the decision on publication;
- Reject the work, but give indications on modifications that could justify a new appreciation;
- Reject the work, explaining the reasons for rejection (can refer to the report of the peer reviewer).

If the author re-submits the previously rejected work, the Board may reject it again without sending it for review if it considers that the modifications made do not meet the reasons underlying the previous rejection or that they do so in a clearly insufficient way.

### **Duties of the reviewers**

Peer reviewers are bound by the duty of confidentiality and in particular are not allowed to give or reveal the content of the reports which they draw up, or any communications with the Editorial Board, to any third party, not even after the decision of the Editorial Board on the publication.



In case they want to convey the work to a colleague understood to be better suited for the examination, the peer reviewer shall so inform the Board, which shall decide accordingly.

If the review is performed by an external reviewer, the name should be on the list of peer reviewers of the journal, being subject to the duties of peer reviewers.

In order to meet the deadlines for publication and avoid an extension of the uncertainty situation with respect to the authors, the Board establishes deadlines for the submission of peer reviewers' reports.

In case of reasonable impossibility of meeting the deadlines, peer reviewers should inform the Board in advance so as to keep the authors informed and / or to find alternatives.

### **Anonymity**

The journal publishes on its website the name of the members of its peer reviewers' board, but will not make known the name of the reviewer who, in particular, will appreciate the work of the author.

Also the name of the author will remain anonymous for the reviewer, with the Editorial Board being committed not to disclose the name before making a decision on the publication, as well as to delete from the text, before the review, all the elements that allow an identification of the author.