

PEER REVIEWING PROCESS

Papers submitted to *STRUCTURAL MAGAZINE* will be subject to refereeing process – **SINGLE-BLIND PEER REVIEW** – by the Editorial Board members and by experts in the fields of paper.

- **SUBMISSION OF PAPER** The submitting Author submits the paper to the journal (following the [SUBMISSION GUIDELINES](#)).
- **APPRAISAL BY THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF** The Editor-in-Chief, with the help of the Assistant Editor, checks that the paper meets the editorial standards of the magazine (see [AIMS AND SCOPE](#)), and that it has a clear scientific character. If not, the paper may be rejected without being reviewed any further. Every submission will receive a reply from the Editor-in-Chief.
- **INVITATION TO REVIEWERS** The Editor-in-Chief assigns the paper to two Editorial Board members and, if necessary, to other external reviewers, who are experts in that specific subject; he/she operates according to the law regulating defamation, copyright and plagiarism.
- **RESPONSE TO INVITATIONS** Potential reviewers consider the invitation. The reviewers shall inform the Editor-in-Chief of any conflicts of interest with the author/authors of the manuscript and, in such cases, decline the review assignment. They then accept or decline. If possible, when declining, they might also suggest alternative reviewers.
- **REVIEW IS CONDUCTED** Reviewers shall remain anonymous and shall ensure this anonymity toward the authors. *Timeliness*: the Editor-in-Chief, while assigning an article to reviewers, shall set the maximum amount of time available for the review. *Privacy*: the manuscripts received for peer review shall be treated as confidential documents. *Standards of objectivity*: peer reviews shall be conducted objectively. Personal criticisms of the author are not, therefore, appropriate. Reviewers shall express their opinions clearly with substantiated motivations. *Acknowledgement of sources*: reviewers shall check that the author of a manuscript always cites the original sources from which his/her work has originated and that the references in the article's bibliography are appropriate. *Disclosure and conflict of interests*: information or original ideas obtained during the peer review process shall be kept confidential and shall not be used to personal advantage.
- **EVALUATION OF THE REVIEWS** The review is then submitted to the Editor-in-Chief, with a recommendation to accept or reject – or else with a request for revision before it is reconsidered. The Editor-in-Chief considers all the returned reviews before making an overall decision. If the reviews differ widely, the editor may invite an additional reviewer so as to get an extra opinion before making a decision.
- **THE DECISION IS COMMUNICATED** The Editor-in-Chief sends a decision email to the corresponding author, including any reviewer comments. The comments are anonymous. The paper, revised according to the comments given in the acceptance email, is checked by the Editor-in-Chief and – if accepted – is then ready for publication.