

Details of the evaluation process of the texts submitted for publication in PASOS, Journal of Tourism and Cultural Heritage (ISSN 1695-7121).

PASOS RTPC publishes the received texts in five different sections, according to the interests of the proposing authors and of the criteria of the reviewers and editorial committee, who justify their proposal, provided it is not according to the manifest interest of the authors.

These sections are: Articles (5000-9000 words), Essays and Reviews (3000-5000 words), Research notes (9,000 words maximum), From the Company (maximum 9,000 words) Chronicle of events (maximum 9,000 words) and Publications' outline (2000-5000 words).

#### **Basic Process of reinforced peer review.**

Once the text is received, whatever its affiliation, one proceeds to acknowledge it within a period not exceeding 72 hours. Once registered in the database and made anonymous, it is included on the waiting list to start the anonymous peer review.

Given the interdisciplinary nature of PASOS, RTPC, depending on the area of specialization of the subject and/or issue addressed in the work, within two months (depending on availability of reviewers) the review will start.

<b>Situation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Consequence</b>
One or both reviewers reject to review the text	We proceed to assign other/s reviewer/s	Delay of at least one month
The issued reports are divergent or slightly different.	We proceed to summarize both reports and the text is revised	Decision making and communication to the author / s
The issued reports are contradictory	We proceed to the assignment of a third reviewer	Delay of at least one month
One or both reports are considered insufficient by the editorial committee	We proceed to the assignment of a third reviewer	Delay of at least one month
<b>The report suggests slight modifications</b>	Communication to the contact author (the first author, unless otherwise specified)	Request to make the suggested changes within the maximum period of one month (Exceptionally, at the authors' request, this term can be extended) and resend
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second and subsequent revised sending</li> </ul>	The Editorial Committee revises and decides whether it is necessary to send it again to the reviewers who issued the initial report.	Acceptance and communication to the author (first author unless otherwise specified)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptance</li> </ul>	It leads to initial layout and publication	Depending on the date of acceptance, it will appear in the following published number
<b>The report points out the need for major changes</b>	Communication to the contact author (the first author, unless otherwise	Request to make the suggested changes in the maximum period of one

	specified)	month (exceptionally, at the authors' request, this can be extended) and resend.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second and subsequent revised sending</li> </ul>	It is sent again to the reviewers who issued the initial report. Inquiries may exceptionally be made to qualified members of the Scientific Committee.	The process is repeated with the same approximate deadlines and the result is reported to the contact author (first author unless otherwise specified).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptance</li> </ul>	It leads to initial layout and publication	Depending on the date of acceptance, it will be appear in the following published number.
The report indicates that the text is rejected.	Communication to the contact author (the first author, unless otherwise specified)	A report is sent justifying our motive to reject the text. In exceptional cases, when the evaluators do not make comments, the editorial committee usually revises the text and issues reports, respecting the criteria of the reviewers.

All the process will be registered with the communication dates in our database, with the attached texts (text in its different versions, evaluation sheets, summary of both, and replies from the authors – if there are any).