

## **GUIDELINES FOR THE REFEREE**

The method for accepting works in the ..... series is very strict and traceable ex post when valuating the quality of the scientific publications.

## **THE ROLE OF THE REFEREE**

Please carefully follow these guidelines about the role of the referee.

### **1. Competence**

The books ..... are not always sent to a referee whose research field is the same as the subject of the book. It is not necessary to be qualified in a particular field to be a constructive referee. But, whenever the book is too far from their research field, they can report it to us and we will look for another referee.

### **2. Confidentiality**

The referee are sent unpublished works, which must be treated in a confidential way until they get published. They should destroy all of the digital copies, the paper copies and the referring card as soon as their report are received by the series .....

The referees do not have to tell other people about the books they referred, nor can share those books with someone else.

### **3. Conflict of interest**

The referees must declare any conflict of interest or any other factor which could influence their independence status: for instance, if they get a book by a colleague or an intellectual enemy. In case of conflict of interest, please let us know about your inability to refer that particular book.

### **4. Intellectual merit**

A book must be only judged for its intellectual merits. Personal critics or ones based on political or social ideas are not acceptable.

### **5. Complete explanation**

Critical or negative judgements must be supported by detailed references, which are adherents to the examined book or to other appropriate sources.

### **6. Plagiarism and Copyright**

If a referee thinks the book may contain plagiarism or violate copyright, they should notify the question to the director of the series, sending an email to the following email addresses: .....

### **7. Reactivity**

The referees are invited to send their reports in no more than two weeks.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The books must be evaluated on ten criteria, or even less if some of them are not significant for a specific text:

1. Significance of the themes
2. Relevance of the themes
3. Clarity of the thematic insights
4. Links to literature

5. Research structure and data
6. Data analysis and use
7. Theory use
8. Critical qualities
9. Clarity of conclusions
10. Communication quality

### REFERRING REPORT: ANALYSIS CARD

The referee must give points on a scale from zero (0) to ten (10). The comment section in the following page shows the detailed criteria. If your comments reach a score of 75% or more, there is no need to insert other comments.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORE
1. Significance of the themes	
2. Relevance of the themes	
3. Clarity of the thematic insights	
4. Links to literature	
5. Research structure and data	
6. Data analysis and use	
7. Theory use	
8. Critical qualities	
9. Clarity of conclusions	
10. Communication quality	
TOTAL SCORE (%)	

If any of the categories are not applicable in the evaluation of a particular book, just write n.a. (non applicable) and count the score using the relevant elements.

### RECOMMENDATION

- (....) ACCEPTED
- (.....) ACCEPTED WITH MINOR REVISIONS
- (....) TO BE SENT AGAIN WITH IMPORTANT REVISIONS
- (.....) REJECTED

Here the score points:

- accepted: 75-100%
- accepted with minor revisions: 60-75%
- to be sent again with important revisions: 40-60%

- rejectes: less than 40%

### IMPORTANT, PLEASE INDICATE:

(....) By an editorial point of view, this book can be published in these standards.

(....) This book needs a minor correction.

(.....)This book needs a deep reworking

### REFEREE'S COMMENTS

Comments and critical suggestions on both the content and the structure of the referring are welcome.

### FOR THE REFEREE

If, as a referee, you wish to make notes to the text, indicate with an 'X' the following:

(...) I did not make notes to the text

(...) I made notes to the text. The method I used is:

Please describe here the way in which you made notes to the text, e.g. BLOCK LETTERS, red text, or using the "review" function in Microsoft Word.

If you have detailed comments, please note them down here.

### REVIEWER COMMENTS

---



---



---



---

Guide lines for the comment: the score table was made up to give a fast comment. You do not need to comment in this section unless:

- one of the criteria was given a low score; or
- you think you should justify some high scores; or
- one of the criteria is told as "not applicable" as the book does not need to be valued by experts; or
- you have advices or specific comments you want to tell the author.

If one of the cases applies or you rejected or recommended the revision, please indicate:

#### 1. Significance of the themes

• Is this the subject which must be treated? The investigation area is: important? Timely? Is there the need to explain why a particular area was not treated? Is it interesting? Are there any gaps to be filled? (The work does not need to have all of these characteristics)

- Is this work a useful contribute to deal with these themes?

## **2. Relevance of the themes**

Are these themes relevant for this publication? If not, is there a more appropriate place where they could be published?

## **3. Clarity of the thematic insights**

- Are the themes clearly showed by the author?
- Does the book treat the themes in a coherent and convincing way?

## **4. Links to literature**

- Does the work show an adequate comprehension of the current literature?
- Is it linked to literature so it can help the future developement of the research area?

## **5. Research structure and data**

- Was the research, or the intellectual activity upon which the book is based well projected?
- Does the book show an adequate use of proofs, informative sources to sustain its contents?

## **6. Data analysis and use**

- The interpretative potential of the data was adequately realized?
- Were the data used in an effective way to promote the themes the book aims to develop?

## **7. Theory use**

- Is the theory used in a significative way?
- Theoric concepts are developed and used to make generalizations believable?

## **8. Critical qualities**

- Does the work show a critical awareness of its own perspectives and of the author's interests?
- Do you see an awareness of the practical implications of the ideas that have been put forward?

## **9. Clarity of conclusions**

- Are the conclusions clearly showed?
- About the choerence of the work: are the conclusions adequately linked to the other parts of the work (e.g. theory, data and critical perspectives)?

## **10. Communication quality**

- Does the book clearly show its main focus, in the sector jargon which makes it possible to read and understand by a college student or a professional?
- Which is the level of writing, spelling and grammar? If necessary, please give specific suggestions or show the errors in a list.