



REFEREEING FORM FOR VOLUMES FIRENZE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The scientific evaluation process for which the Editorial Board of the publishing house is responsible is defined in the Peer review policy and in the Publication Ethics and Complaint policy, integral parts of the FUP Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing.

Title of the manuscript:
Name of the Author/Editor:
Referee's first and last name:
Referee's ORCID identifier:
Referee's affiliation:
Date:

I. Manuscript evaluation:

The referee should express the evaluation starting from more general and relevant information and then get to more detailed and operational indications to support. The reviewer report must be sufficiently articulated and motivated to support the assessment (typically, at least 150/200 words).

Particularly, the referee should:

- 1) Offer a summary of the study and an initial general evaluation, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript according to the following parameters:
 - Scientific relevance of the discussed topic.
 - Novelty and originality of the manuscript.
 - Suitability of the work to the present state of knowledge on the subject.
 - Methodological rigour and coherent organization of the material.
 - Clarity and style of the text.
 - Quality and extent of bibliography used.
- 2) Offer an analytical indication, supported by examples, of the major and minor issues of the manuscript. Regarding the major issues, the recommendations must highlight the main issues that the author needs to address in order for the manuscript to continue its evaluation process and finally be published. The referee must also point out the minor issues which, while not affecting the overall evaluation of the manuscript, must be improved.

...

II. Confidential comments/suggestions for the Director/Publisher of the series:

In this section the referee, if they deem it appropriate, can add confidential comments for the Publisher, the Director of the series or the Editor responsible for the evaluation, indicating those aspects of the manuscript that may require further investigation – for example, ethical issues.

...

III. Referee's opinion (required):

Excellent ____.

Significant ____.

Moderately significant ____.

Marginal ____.

Non-significant (rejected) ____.

Accepted ____.

Accepted subject to revision ____;

Rejected. Resubmit after extensive revision ____;

Rejected ____.