

Process of peer-review

The scientific quality of the articles is provided by a peer review carried out by eminent scholars. Reviewers are anonymous. The Journal is also committed to ensure the impartiality of the review process.

The process of article review takes place at two levels:

1°. Formal evaluation of scientific quality minimum requirements, carried out by Editor-in-Chief and Senior Editor.

The contributions sent to the editorial staff will be examined by the Editor-in-Chief and Scientific Managers of the Journal, each of them being responsible for drafting an initial evaluation of the formal requirements and minimum standards of scientific quality of the product sent.

2°. Double-blind peer review Process.

If the contribution sent passes this first evaluation, it will be inserted in an anonymous assessment process (double blind peer review). The auditors, in this process, will remain anonymous to the author, as well as authors to the reviewers.

To guarantee the process, the Editorial Staff will hide the authors' names in the text and all the other parts of the file where it could be seen, as well as in Microsoft Office documents or equivalent.

The referees' evaluation will be written in the form of a brief analytical note on the areas identified below, highlighting strong and weak points in the writing.

The areas being assessed are the following:

- Pertinence of the content;
- Scientific value;
- Scientific exactness;
- Originality;
- Adequacy of arguments and conclusions;
- Style of writing;
- Pertinence of Bibliography

At the end of each area auditors are invited to give a numerical rating on a scale ranging from "a" to "e" where "a" stands for excellent and "e" for not publishable.

NARRARE I GRUPPI

Ethnography of everyday interaction. Clinical and social perspectives - www.narrareigruppi.it

The evaluators' card also includes a final synthetic judgment accompanied once again by a metric scale:

- a - *Excellent, to be published;*
- b - *Good: it requires only minor adjustments;*
- c - *Corrigible gaps: to be reassessed for publication;*
- d - *Serious and substantive gaps: not to be published.*
- e - *Comments and suggestions to the author.*

The referees' favorable or unfavorable evaluation will always be anonymously sent to the author with or without suggestions.

If the referees' evaluation specifically requests changes to the text, the author will have a period of 20 days from the reception of the article to carry them out. Just after this due date the Editor-in-Chief and / or Managers of the relevant scientific areas will express their final opinion.

If the contribution sent by the authors does not meet the editorial criteria and the quality of scientific inquiry, the contribution will not be accepted and the authors will be informed about the reasons for non-acceptance through a detailed written response from the Editor-In-Chief. The material will not be returned.

It is however possible to publish articles upon invitation, or spontaneously, written by nationally or internationally renowned scholars. These articles will not be subject to the review process and will be accompanied by a note by the Editor-in-Chief and / or the Scientific Manager of the corresponding area which will briefly describe their origin and ensure their quality level.

The Editorship