

Las Torres de Lucca

Reviewer's Form

Las Torres de Lucca appreciates your thoughtful review of this manuscript.

We understand the evaluation process as a constructive instance, which contributes to the production of knowledge. In this regard, we encourage reviewers not only to assess the academic quality of work but also to provide, if possible, grounded significant contributions for improvement, regardless of whether the submission is accepted for publication.

Authors will appreciate it and will be able to benefit from your evaluation.

Reviews are double-blind and your comments will be provided to the author(s) anonymously.

Please express your evaluation and comments by filling in this form and mail it to editorial@lastorresdelucca.org in four weeks' time.

In case you could not complete the evaluation, please contact us by mail and let us know.

Submission Title:

[1] Relevance to the field and originality

Las Torres de Lucca aims to publish articles which make a specific contribution to the field of study. We are especially interested in articles that go beyond the description of topics or discussions and make a significant or original contribution in the area.

Thus, if the originality or the scientific contribution of the submission is low or very low (1, 2) the article should not be recommended for publication.

1 (lowest)	2	3	4	5 (highest)
------------	---	---	---	-------------

[2] Subject mastery and reference to the literature

Please state if the bibliography used is relevant and updated and if the author proves to be aware of previous discussions on the same topic and covers different options/perspectives in the literature.

1 (lowest)	2	3	4	5 (highest)
------------	---	---	---	-------------

[3] Clarity and coherence

- a) Is it a coherent manuscript? Are the objectives, hypotheses, assumptions, theoretical references and conclusions clear?
- b) Is the article well written and clear? Are unfamiliar concepts defined? We remind reviewers that one of the author guidelines included in our Editorial Policy states that authors need to take into consideration the accessibility and clarity of texts for readers from different backgrounds and avoid making use of specialized jargons. This policy is relevant as it aims to facilitate the communication and wider discussion of the work.

1 (lowest)	2	3	4	5 (highest)
------------	---	---	---	-------------

[4] Adherence to the Journal's formatting guidelines and formal aspects

a) Does the submission adhere to the formatting guidelines?

b) How do you evaluate formal aspects of the work?

- Length
- Style
- Syntax

- Formal organization of text (clear distinction of different parts of the manuscript: literature review, discussion, conclusion, concept explanation, use of footnotes, use of quotes...)

1 (lowest)	2	3	4	5 (highest)
------------	---	---	---	-------------

[5] Title and abstract

a) Is the title clear and appropriate?

b) Does the abstract clearly present the topic and goal of the paper)

1 (lowest)	2	3	4	5 (highest)
------------	---	---	---	-------------

[6] Are acronyms, table descriptions, figures or illustrations (if any) clear and necessary?

1 (lowest)	2	3	4	5 (highest)
------------	---	---	---	-------------

[7] Publication Recommendation (check one)

- Accept as it is (for submissions with high scores in questions 1-6)
- Accept pending revisions. (Suggested modification specified in reviewer's comments. For submissions with average scores)
- Revise and resubmit, with suggested modification specified in reviewer's comments (for submissions with low scores in questions 1-6)
- Reject (for submissions which are not appropriate for this Journals)

[8] Reviewer's comments to the author. Please make explicit here the modifications and comments on specific issues that the author(s) could address directly in order to improve the article or rewrite it.

[9] Reviewer's comments to the editors.

Thank you for your kind contribution

The Editors