

## Peer-review process

All the manuscripts submitted for any of the USC Editora series undergo a double evaluation process, internal and external.

**Internal evaluation.** Internal referees are selected by the Academic Editorial Committee upon proposal of the director of the University Press; they are renowned scholars from the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela who belong to sixteen thematic areas. Since the reception of the manuscript and its due acknowledgement, the time limit for the internal evaluation of the manuscript and for its communication to the authors is **one month**. The referee's report is fundamentally designed to decide whether the manuscript, in view of its apparent characteristics (be they formal, stylistic, or related to its possible relevance, interest and up-to-dateness), is fit or not to proceed to the second stage, that of external evaluation. Therefore, depending on the conclusions of the internal referee's report; (a) the manuscript as it stands can proceed to the stage of external evaluation; (b) the manuscript can proceed to the stage of external evaluation after the incorporation of a series of modifications and suggested corrections; to do this the authors have **one month** from the date of communication of the internal referee's report; (c) the manuscript cannot proceed to the stage of external evaluation. Since the approval of the manuscript – cases (a) and eventually (b) – the time limit to send it for external evaluation is **fifteen days**.

**External evaluation.** The task of external evaluation is given to two independent specialists in the manuscript's specific subject who do not belong to the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela. These specialists are proposed by the internal referee who must include in the assessment form a list of five names, ranked in order of preference. The two specialists selected by the editorial team of the University Press conduct an in-depth theoretical, conceptual and methodological examination of the manuscript; this allows them to identify those aspects that can be improved on the basis of such criteria as agreement with the intended purpose, originality of approach, up-to-dateness and relevance, structural consistency and suitable organization of headings. Since the referees' acceptance, the time limit for the external evaluation is **three months**. Depending on the result of the external evaluation, (a) the manuscript, positively evaluated by both reviewers, must incorporate all their suggested modifications and corrections; b) in case of a clear disagreement between the evaluations of both reviewers (one positive and the other negative), a third evaluation report will be asked (from then same list of specialists provided by the internal referee), which will again have **three months** from the date of acceptance; c) owing to its negative evaluation by both reviewers, the manuscript's publication is rejected.

The Academic Editorial Committee is the body in charge of assessing the external evaluation of the manuscript and of deciding accordingly. Once the reviewers' reports have been received, its presentation to the Academic Editorial Committee must take place within a maximum of **three months** from the reception of the later report. The Committee's decision, together with a copy of the external referees' confidential reports, will be sent to the author by the director of the University Press within a maximum of **fifteen days** from the date of the Committee's meeting. In the case of a positive evaluation the author must submit the new draft of the manuscript, modified according to the referees' suggestions and directions, within a maximum of **one month** from the date of communication of the decision. The editorial team of the University Press, which coordinates the whole process, will finally check if the new version complies with the referees' suggestions and directions. The team has a maximum of **four months** for editing and producing the work.