

The Editorial Staff specifies that the journal adopts the single-blind referee system, with an anonymous and confidential review process in which the identity of both the Reviewers and the Authors will therefore remain confidential.

### Questionnaire

The Reviewer assigns a score to the various aspects of the article:

1 = *inadequate*; 2 = *sufficient*; 3 = *good*; 4 = *very good*; 5 = *excellent*

- |           |   |     |     |     |     |     |
|-----------|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| <b>A.</b> | ORIGINALITY AND RELEVANCE OF THE CONTRIBUTION:  | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| <b>B.</b> | CONSISTENCY AND CLARITY OF THE ARGUMENTS AND OF THE REFERENCE<br>METHODOLOGICAL SYSTEM: | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| <b>C.</b> | SUITABILITY AND TOPICALITY OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND CRITICAL SETUP:                   | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |

### Opinion

A concise opinion by the Auditor, in discursive form, is appreciated:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

The Reviewer can provide suggestions for any improvements or additions to the text, which will be communicated to the author:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Conclusive synthetic judgement

The article is

- publishable in its current form
- publishable after the suggested changes
- not publishable