

Dear colleague,

we sincerely thank you for accepting to evaluate the annexed article (which is going to be examined also by a second referee). We consider your qualified contribution very important to improve the quality and excellence standards of our Journal.

You are hence requested to classify the works assigned to your evaluation according to the following criteria:

1. It is necessary to evaluate the relevance and the originality of the proposed researches and the added value compared to the current state of art.

2. It is necessary to consider and to mainly focus on the core of the work, evaluating in a different way secondary aspects that can be subjected to criticism. Secondary aspects cannot in fact cause the work to be rejected, but, if the kernel of the article is valid, they can be modified according to the referee’s advices.

3. The core of the work must be firstly evaluated for its internal coherence, that is chiefly expressed in the relation among the title, the abstract (that should thereby sum up the kernel of the work) and the development of the reasoning illustrated in the article.

4. Given that several theories in our fields of research are very controversial and that there are different, sometimes opposite, directions, the referee is not allowed to prejudicially reject a theoretical position he doesn’t agree with.

5. The analysis of the text should not only stress critical points, but can also suggest advices to improve the author’s work.

We confirm that the names of the referees will be kept confidential and we remind you that the evaluation procedure is anonymous, as it is the article that we send you, that obliges you to the outmost secrecy.

The Editorial Board

**Guidelines**

All articles submitted to *Thiasos* Editorial Board are subjected to referees’ evaluation.

The referees’ judgment is composed by three parts:

* Firstly, the referee should assign points on a one-to-five scale;
* Secondly, the referee should write down a discursive comment, where reasons for his/her evaluation are illustrated and where possible adjustments in the article are suggested, in the case he/she holds the article can be published in a new version;
* Thirdly and lastly, he/she must express the definitive evaluation, by making a choice among four possibilities.

The referee should note that the just mentioned three parts shall be sent not only to the Editorial Board, but also, in anonymous form, to the Author and to the second referee.

Referees are requested to transmit their judgments to the Editorial Board as soon as possible. Once the Editorial Board receives the evaluations by all referees, it decides whether and how the article can be accepted. The evaluation results are transmitted, in anonymous way, to the Author and to both referees, so that each referee can compare his/her own judgment to the other referee’s one.

Referees are volunteers and are not going to receive any remuneration by Thiasos Journal. In a specific section of the website all referees are formally thanked and their names are published in alphabetic order.

In order to carry out the evaluation procedure, please download the relevant document in .pdf format:

EVALUATION FORM

**Part 1: Questionnaire**

Assign points ranging from 1 to 5 to each of the following aspects of the article. Please note that:

1 = *not at all*

2 = *enough*

3 = *more than enough*

4 = *very*

5 = *very much*

Each score could be accompanied by comments and explanations. Should the referee not be sure of a certain aspect (for instance on part D, as he/she is not expert of the specific literature concerning the topic), he/she should not assign points and should leave the box blank (given that to select an intermediate score is an error, since it implies an evaluation):

**A.** The subject holds scientific relevance: … points

**B.** The article can be regarded as original and significant: … points

**C.** The illustrated reasoning is internally coherent, also with the title and the abstract, and properly developed, regardless it can be accepted or not: … points

**D.** The work includes a critical review of the existing literature, takes into account the historical development of the examined concepts, considers different points of view, even if these are different or even opposite when compared to the Author’s ones, informs regarding the latest researches and outputs on the topic: … points

**E.** The article is correct under a grammatical and syntactic point of view, is flowing, easy to understand: … points

**Part 2: Discursive evaluation**

The anonymous judgment, together with the questionnaire’s points and the final evaluation, will be transmitted to the other referee and to the Author and therefore, in case of negative evaluation, belittling or offensive sentences should be avoided. In this section, where necessary, advices regarding parts that should be modified, improved or corrected can be illustrated.

(Write directly in the space below):

**Part 3: Concise final judgment (please mark the selected judgment)**

The examined article is

🗆 *Publishable in the present form or with a minimum editing*

🗆 *Publishable with suggested modifications*

🗆 *Maybe publishable in a new version if re-reviewed*

🗆 *Not publishable*