



PEER REVIEW PROCESS

1. The Editorial Board will carry out an initial review prior to the external evaluation process in order to check that the **articles** received (both those for publication in the miscellaneous section and those appearing in the monographic section) meet the journal criteria in terms of topic, quality of writing and length. The Board will also check that articles are based on original research and that they have not been previously published in any other form or in any other language. Articles should also comply with [the presentation standards required for publication](#) in *Caplletra*; if this is not the case, they will be returned to authors to make the appropriate changes before resubmitting them to the journal editors within a period not exceeding fifteen days.
2. The external evaluation process begins once papers have passed through the Editorial Board filter. This is a strictly anonymous double-blind peer review. It is performed by experts from outside the IIFV, the journal publishing body and the Editorial Board. This process is handled directly by *Caplletra* management. Each paper and monographic article is evaluated by two researchers chosen from members of the Scientific Committee, from the External Reviewers' Committee or by renowned experts in the topics addressed who are occasionally asked to review a paper or monographic article.
3. Each reviewer will write a report specifying the reasons for accepting, requesting changes or rejecting the paper. The review will take into account the editing guidelines issued by the journal and the criteria of originality, relevance, methodological rigour and formal presentation of papers submitted.
4. Reviewers may recommend papers be published without any alterations or may suggest some corrections in order for an article to be published. In this case, reviewers' indications will be conveyed to the authors so they can make the necessary changes and return the corrected version within a period not exceeding fifteen days.
5. If the two external reviewers consider that the paper is not suitable for publication, *Caplletra* will abide by their decision and inform the author/s, giving the reasons cited in the reviewers' report. If the reviewers cannot agree on whether a paper should be published or not, the Editorial Board will take the final decision. If there is agreement that a paper should be published, the director of the journal and the editor's secretary will supervise the insertion of any changes required to refine the text.
6. The journal undertakes to preserve the anonymity of both authors and reviewers throughout the review process.
7. *Caplletra* undertakes to review papers and tell authors whether their work has been accepted or not within a period not exceeding five months from the prior review carried out by the Editorial Board.
8. **Reviews** will be assessed by the *Caplletra* Editorial Board, which will need to check that they consist of original work that has not been previously published in any other medium or in any other language, and that they comply with journal criteria in terms of topic, quality and length. Texts must also comply with [journal presentation standards](#); if this is not the case, they will be returned to the author/s for the necessary changes to be made within a period not exceeding fifteen days.
9. *Caplletra* does not necessarily share the views held in the papers published.