PEER REVIEW FORM

Thank you for agreeing to refer this article.

Double blind peer review

Your report will be communicated to the author **completely anonymously**. The article will be evaluated by another anonymous referee who will not be informed of its previous review. In the event that the article, according to the report provided by one or both referees, is publishable only following a thorough revision, the editorial team assumes the responsibility of verifying that the author has made the necessary corrections. In the event that the two referees express clearly conflicting views, the editorial staff reserves the right to make the final decision.
The content of the referrals shall be kept strictly confidential. The authors, by accepting their article to be reviewed, undertake not to disclose the content of the referrals. The referees shall not disclose the content of the article during the refereeing process.

Guidelines:

The objective of peer review is to identify and indicate the qualities and limitations of reviewed article. Your peer review and your comments should conform to the following guidelines:

- what changes would make the article clearer, more coherent and relevant to the issue addressed?
- what interventions would help the article contribute more significantly to the historiography of the topic?
- how to intervene in order to strengthen any controversial or questionable passage?

Peer review

For the reviewer: if you have to communicate further information to the editorial team **but not to the author**, do not include it in this form but in the body of the email to which the review will be attached.
For the author: highlight the changes made based on the reviewers' comments graphically in the text in order to facilitate the comparison between the first and second draft (use the highlight tool or font colour or the underline tool. Do not use bold or italics).

Title:

Have you already written a referee report for the said text for another publication or have you already read the text? YES NO

Research quality:
[1] Excellent: adequate methodology and reliable interpretation

[2] Competent: no serious shortcomings

[3] Mostly competent but with some shortcomings

[4] Weak: numerous shortcomings and discrepancies

Bibliography

Bibliography seems to be adequate? YES NO

Suggestions for the author:

.....

Organization of the text:

Organization of the text is satisfactory? YES NO

The article is clear? YES NO

Suggestions for the author: .....

Length:

The article can be shortened without altering the argument? *If so, where?* YES NO

The annotations are adequate? YES NO

OVERALL EVALUATION

The article may be accepted for publication?

[1] Yes, *without* revisions

[2] Yes, with *few* revisions

[3] Yes, with *numerous* revisions [4] No

In case [2], [3] or [4] state the reviews and comments in detail (report separately)

In case [3] state whether you are available to check the new draft of the article or do you prefer to delegate the editing: .....

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTED REVISIONS

If applicable, specify how and where do you suggest interventions in the text.

[**FOR THE AUTHOR**: Changes made in the second draft have to be highlighted or underlined]: Date:

_____