Review process

PASOS Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural | PASOS. Journal of Tourism and Cultural Heritage publishes texts in five different sections according to the interests of the proposing authors and the criteria of the reviewers and the Editorial Board, who justify their proposals whenever they differ from the authors' expressed interests. The sections are: Articles (5,000-9,000 words), Opinions and essays (3,000-5,000 words), Research notes (3,000-5,000 words), From the company (2,000-3,000 words), Event reports (2,000-3,000 words) and Book reviews (2,000-3,000 words).

Basic double-blind peer review process

Once the text has been received, regardless of the section to which it has been submitted, receipt is acknowledged automatically. Once it has been registered in the database and anonymity of the text has been checked, it is included on the waiting list for the blind peer review to begin. Due to ***PASOS***' interdisciplinary nature, depending on the specialist subject and/or issue addressed in the work, the review will begin within two months (depending on the reviewers' availability).

Reviewers should acknowledge receipt of the texts and the model review form within a week. They have a month to complete their report. The following table shows some possible situations, procedures followed and immediate consequences:

Situation	Response	Consequence
One or both reviewers decline to review the text.	Text assigned to another reviewer or reviewers.	Delay of at least one month.
The reports are not in agreement or are slightly different.	Both reports are summarised and the text is revised.	A decision is made and the author(s) is/are notified.
The reports contradict each other.	Text is assigned to a third reviewer.	Delay of at least one month.
One or both reports are considered insufficient by the editorial board.	Text is assigned to a third reviewer.	Delay of at least one month.
The report suggests slight modifications.	The corresponding author (the first author, unless otherwise specified) is notified.	Request to make the suggested changes within one month (exceptionally, at the authors' request, this deadline may be extended) and resubmission.
• Submission after second and subsequent revisions	The editorial board revises the text and decides whether it is necessary to send it to the reviewers who issued the initial report.	Acceptance and notification of the author (first author unless otherwise specified).

• Acceptance	Initial typesetting and publication.	Depending on the date of acceptance, it will appear in the next issue to be published.
The report points out the need for major changes.	The corresponding author (the first author, unless otherwise specified) is notified.	Request to make the suggested changes within one month (exceptionally, at the authors' request, this deadline may be extended) and resubmission.
• Submission after second and subsequent revisions	It is sent to the reviewers who issued the initial report. Inquiries may exceptionally be made of qualified members of the Scientific Board.	The process is repeated with roughly the same deadlines and the result is reported to the corresponding author (the first author unless otherwise specified).
• Acceptance	Initial typesetting and publication.	Depending on the date of acceptance, it will appear in the next issue to be published.
The report indicates that the text has been rejected.	The corresponding author (the first author, unless otherwise specified) is notified.	A report is sent justifying our reasons for rejecting the text. In exceptional cases, when the reviewers do not make comments, the editorial board usually revises the text and issues a report, respecting the reviewers' criteria.

The entire process is recorded with the dates of every communication on our management system (Open Journal System, OJS), together with the texts attached (different versions of the texts, review sheets, summary of both and replies from the authors, if applicable).