

## Review Form – ENGLISH – 2025/05

Definition of “scientific character of contributions” pursuant to Article 17, paragraph 1(a), of the [Regulations for the Classification of Journals \(Approved by Resolution No. 306 of the ANVUR Board of Directors on 21 December 2023\)](#): “Originality, rigorous application of methodological tools and depth of critical analysis, as well as the richness and relevance of sources and bibliographic information, and the importance of positioning within the international debate (where relevant to the discipline)”.

### This form is organised as follows:

1. It begins with a **question about the paper length**. The Editorial Team will check this, but authors are always advised to verify it themselves. Short submissions sometimes include substantial tables that compensate for the lack of text.
2. Next, there is a series of **questions whose answers will be shown to the Authors**. Each question offers four response levels. Please note that “*Must be improved*” sets a binding requirement (and is therefore more suited to major revisions), whereas “*May be improved*” leaves it to the Authors’ discretion. “*Not applicable*” is not necessarily negative (depending on the type of contribution), but it becomes negative if expectations in that area are very high. Note also that theoretical articles, although non-empirical, cannot dispense with proper methodological rigour.
3. This is followed by some *compliance* questions concerning: **conflicts of interest, plagiarism and ethics**. These questions refer to the content of the submission. For instance, the conflict-of-interest question *does not concern the External Reviewer* (who must inform the Editorial Team separately if any conflict exists). It concerns the Authors. If you detect violations, tick “yes”; otherwise, “no”. **Recommendation:** reviewers are not expected to run anti-plagiarism software. The journal already uses PlagiarismCheckerX and Turnitin, generally *before* sending the text to External Reviewers. However, an External Reviewer may still spot plagiarism that software missed—please report it.
4. Further **general assessment questions for editorial use** follow.
5. You may attach files with recommended revisions. Please make sure to **anonymise every file** you upload.
6. In the final decision, **avoid selecting “submit to another journal”** (this is an OJS option that cannot be removed, assuming a “handover” between journals of the same publisher). Remember that requesting **major revisions** usually implies the External Reviewer wishes to receive the file again with substantial changes.
7. The *COPE Guidelines* assign the Editorial Team the final responsibility for editorial-flow decisions. This means that, in light of other External Reviewers’ reports, the editors may deem “minor changes” sufficient where only one reviewer asked for major changes—or conversely require “major changes” and “substantial rewriting” if two reviewers requested *many* minor changes. The journal’s *policy* also allows for an arbitrator (a third External Reviewer) when reports are markedly divergent. Such situations often arise from an **inconsistency between the narrative report and the answers ticked in the questionnaire**. Consistency is therefore strongly encouraged.

**Does the paper's length meet the [journal's policies](#)?**

Articles are supposed to be between 3,500–6,000 words excluding abstract, tables, figures, graphs, and references? (the Editorial Team strives to ensure compliance before sending the paper to Reviewers, but we may occasionally miss a paper).

**[IMPORTANT: if the answer to this question is NO, please interrupt the review immediately and contact your editor at [formazione.insegnamento@pensamultimedia.it](mailto:formazione.insegnamento@pensamultimedia.it)]**

Yes No

**Introduction and State of the Art**

Does the introduction and literature review provide sufficient background and include the most relevant bibliographic references? Do they contribute to a clear identification of the problem or question addressed by the paper?

(Answer to this question will be shown to the Author)

- Yes
- Can be improved
- Must be improved
- Not applicable

**Conceptualisation and Research Design**

Is the research (theoretical, empirical or otherwise) well conceived and well designed?

(Answer to this question will be shown to the Author)

- Yes
- Can be improved
- Must be improved
- Not applicable

**Methodology**

Is the methodology (theoretical, empirical or otherwise) adequately described (including the instruments and techniques adopted, as well as appropriate bibliographic references to methodological literature)?

(Answer to this question will be shown to the Author)

*Reviewers are invited to take into account that theoretical research might present methodologies in article sections that are different from those of experimental and quasi-experimental research designs.*

- Yes
- Can be improved
- Must be improved
- Not applicable

**Results**

Are the results (theoretical, empirical or otherwise) presented clearly? Do they constitute the actual outcome of the methodology employed?

(Answer to this question will be shown to the Author)

- Yes
- Can be improved
- Must be improved
- Not applicable

## Discussion and Conclusions

Are the discussion and conclusions relevant and supported by the results obtained?

(Answer to this question will be shown to the Author)

- Yes
- Can be improved
- Must be improved
- Not applicable

## Bibliographic References

Are the references cited in the text *relevant* to the research presented? Is there any *imbalance* in the bibliography? Are important references missing?

(Answer to this question will be shown to the Author)

- Yes
- Can be improved
- Must be improved
- Not applicable

## Linguistic Adequacy

How appropriate is the use of language in the main language of the article?

(The answer to this question will be sent to the Author)

[If you are not at least C1, C2 or native proficiency in the relevant language, please indicate “not qualified”]

- I am not qualified to assess the quality of the manuscript's language
- The language is difficult to understand/incomprehensible
- Extensive editing required
- Minor editing required
- The language is fine / no issues detected

## Conflicts of interest in the article and/or in the study

As an external reviewer, have you identified any potential conflicts of interest in the manuscript (including undue forms of self-promotion, irrespective of the required anonymity)?

(The answer to this question will NOT be sent to the Author)

[This question does *not* concern any conflicts of interest of the external reviewer, which must be promptly reported to the Editorial Team *before* completing this form]

[If you answer “yes” to this question, please provide further details in the comments form addressed to the Editorial Team]

- Yes
- No

## Research Ethics

Do you believe there are ethical issues concerning the study presented in the manuscript or its text?

(The answer to this question will NOT be sent to the Author)

[If you answer “yes” to this question, please provide further details in the comments section addressed to the Editorial Team]

- Yes
- No

## Plagiarism

In your personal opinion, does the manuscript contain plagiarism (including errors in marking direct quotations, even bona fide)?

(Answer to this question will NOT be shown to the Author)

[if you answer "yes" to this question, please provide further details in the comment box addressed to the editor]

**Note:** the journal already carries out a preliminary plagiarism check or during the copyediting phase. It is therefore not necessary for the reviewer to use dedicated software. Please answer this question based on your personal experience.

- Yes
- No

## Artificial Intelligence

The journal's [policy](#) requires Authors to disclose any use of AI at the proposal stage. It also requires Authors to refrain from submitting manuscripts already translated with automatic services and to agree any translations with the Editorial Team. The use of AI and the External Reviewer's judgement on it *do not automatically lead to withdrawal or rejection of the article, but help the Editorial Team to determine whether the conditions for publication are met.* External Reviewers are not expected to run AI-detection software, but to respond according to their own perception.

**Please tick one or more of the following boxes according to what you have observed, avoiding contradictory choices.**

- Text: Not qualified to judge AI use in the text (the reviewer does not feel able to evaluate)
- Text: No evident AI use in the text (language appears human, coherent, with verifiable citations)
- Text: Sections of the text probably generated by AI (tone or structure typical of automated output)
- Text: Suspected AI-generated references or citations (false or inaccurate)
- Text: Suspected and undeclared AI use (general perception of extensive automated assistance)
- Research: Not qualified to judge AI use in the research (the reviewer lacks specific expertise)
- Research: No AI use in the research
- Research: AI declared and appropriate (e.g., ML models for data analysis, NLP tools for corpora: described and justified)
- Research: AI used to generate synthetic data or simulations (image, text synthesis, virtual environments, etc.)
- Research: AI for data collection (automated web-scraping, smart sensors, survey chatbots)
- Research: Figures, images or graphics generated by AI (Midjourney, DALL-E, etc.)
- Research: Suspected and undeclared AI use in the research (algorithms cited vaguely, lack of code or parameters)

## ORIGINALITY

(Answer to this question will NOT be shown to the Author)

- High
- Average
- Low

## SIGNIFICANCE OF CONTENT

(Answer to this question will NOT be shown to the Author)

- High
- Average
- Low

**QUALITY OF PRESENTATION**

(Answer to this question will NOT be shown to the Author)

- High
- Average
- Low

**SCIENTIFIC SOUNDNESS**

(Answer to this question will NOT be shown to the Author)

- High
- Average
- Low

**LEVEL OF INTEREST TO THE READERS**

(Answer to this question will NOT be shown to the Author)

- High
- Average
- Low

**OVERALL MERIT**

(Answer to this question will NOT be shown to the Author)

- High
- Average
- Low

**Comments and Suggestions for Authors**

(will be shown to Authors)

Blank space

**Comments for Editors**

(will NOT be shown to Authors)

Blank space

**Final recommendation**

Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

- Accept in present form
- Accept after minor revisions (minor errors, will not be sent again to Reviewers)
- Accept after major revisions (a new round of Review will be opened)
- Submit to another journal or publication
- Reject (article has serious flaws, the study is biased, research is not conducted correctly)
- See comments

**Note:** The options “submit to another journal or publication” and “see comments” are deprecated by *Formazione & insegnamento* but cannot be removed owing to them being hardcoded into the PKP OJS management system.