

1. Editorial process for articles

Ciudades follows working protocols that seek the greatest transparency and quality to the process of reception, evaluation and publication of articles, which consists of the following stages:

1. Initial review: It is carried out by the journal's Editorial Office once the article has been sent and the deadline for submission of articles for the corresponding issue has expired.

Firstly, the authorship of the article is checked, applying the plagiarism detection tool provided by the Servicio de las Tecnologías de la Información y las Comunicaciones de la Universidad de Valladolid (STIC), which is currently *Turnitin*. In case of detection of plagiarism, the article will be discarded and its author will lose, at least, the possibility of publishing it in the corresponding issue of the journal, which will reserve the right to bring such malpractice to the attention of the relevant authorities and, where appropriate, the research funding institutions.

Secondly, the article is checked for compliance with the guidelines of presentation of manuscripts and for the absence of relevant technical-formal defects. If the non-compliances or defects are abundant or substantial, the authors will be asked to rectify them within a maximum period of seven days. If the article is not re-sent within the deadline, it will be rejected.

The Director of the journal will notify the authors of the result of the initial review within approximately fifteen days after the closing date for submission of articles.

2. Preliminary acceptance: It is decided by the Editorial Board, which assesses whether the article fits within the thematic scope of the journal and meets the requirements of originality, interest, methodological rigour and relevance.

Authors will be notified of preliminary acceptance or rejection of the article within approximately one month after the notification of the initial review.

3. Peer review: The articles received for the Monographic and Miscellaneous sections that have been preliminarily accepted by the Editorial Board will be submitted to the opinion of two external evaluators to the journal's Editorial Board, specialists in the field.

The scientific review of the contributions will be totally anonymous, both in terms of the identity of the authors and the identity of the evaluators in charge of the opinion, according to the "double blind" modality.

The selection of the evaluators is a responsibility of the Director of the journal, who may require, if necessary, the advice of the coordinator of the Monographic section and the members of the Editorial Board. The judgements of the two evaluators will be absolutely taken into account, and if they are not in agreement or raise doubts, a third evaluation will be requested.

The Director of the journal will ask the evaluators to send their reports as soon as possible, and once they have been received, both will be immediately sent to the authors.

4. Revision by the author: According to the reports of the evaluators, the Director of the journal may require the authors to introduce modifications in their article, for which they will have an approximate period of one month. Likewise, the correction of any formal defect that has not been previously corrected will be required. If one or two of the evaluators so request, the article will be sent back to them for evaluation.

If appropriate, the authors will send the revised article to the Director of the journal. They must clearly indicate the changes that have been made, along with an explanatory text of these changes, justifying compliance with the indications of the external evaluators.

5. Final acceptance: Once the authors send their revised articles, the journal's Editorial Board will decide on their final acceptance or rejection, at the proposal of the Director of the journal and taking into

account the reports of the external evaluators.

The final acceptance of the article, or its rejection, will be notified to the authors by the Director of the journal. Each article will include on its first page the date of receipt (entry into the Editorial Office) and of final acceptance (date on which the Director proposed such acceptance, then approved by the Editorial Board).

6. Publication: After the notification of final acceptance, the Director of the journal will send the authors, within a maximum of one month, a proof of their article, already formatted in PDF, for their final review. Only spelling or grammatical corrections will be accepted, excluding substantial alterations to the content of the text. Authors must communicate any changes within a maximum period of one week.

The article will be published in digital format within a maximum period of nine months from the closing date for submission of articles for the corresponding issue. Each author will also receive a paper copy of the issue in which their article has been published.

2. Editorial process for reviews/notes

After an initial review equivalent to that for articles and also carried out by the journal's Editorial Office, the reviews/notes received for their publication in the Final section will be reviewed directly by the Director of the journal, who may request the assistance of other members of the Editorial Board or external experts if necessary.

The Director may request the authors to make any changes that he considers appropriate, both in terms of form and content. After the incorporation, where appropriate, of these changes, the Editorial Board of the journal will decide on their final acceptance or rejection, at the proposal of the Director of the journal. The definitive acceptance of the review/note, or its rejection, will be notified to the authors by the Director of the journal. After notification of final acceptance, the publication stage is equivalent to that of the articles.

The Director may commission reviews of publications or events that he considers of interest to the journal's readers and will also attend to suggestions received in this regard by the Editorial Office, which may also include a suggestion regarding the possible author. In any case, the Director may accept or reject totally or partially the suggestions received.

3. Instructions for evaluators

Committed to editorial transparency, **Ciudades** informs the authors of the instructions that are sent to the evaluators regarding the evaluation criteria of originality, interest, methodological rigor and relevance of the articles, as well as the way in which the review is carried out.

The Director of the journal will send the article to the selected potential evaluator, from which any identification of the author will be previously withdrawn, as well as an evaluation template. He or she will be asked about his or her availability and ability to carry out the task, warned about maintaining confidentiality regarding the article and the review, notified of the absence of financial compensation, expressly informed of the time limit available to him or her, and provided with the criteria-guidelines for evaluation. It shall also be given the opportunity to abstain if he or she is unable to carry out the evaluation and, in particular, if he or she perceives any conflict of interest.

The evaluation report will include a general assessment of the article based on four criteria (1st- characterisation of the article, 2nd- contributions, relevance and originality, 3rd- overall assessment of the quality of the work and 4th- final recommendation), a table of review of the technical and scientific aspects (in two parts, 1st- structure and style, and 2nd- rationale, methodology, results and discussion), as well as a section for comments for the author (with possible proposals for improvement, mainly in terms of scientific

content), and a final section for confidential comments for the Director of the journal (especially the indication of excellence or priority in publication).

The evaluation should take into account the following general aspects: regarding the technical-formal aspects, the style and above all the clarity and solidity of the structure of the article; regarding the contents, its suitability for the journal, the interest for its readers, its rationale, originality, scientific relevance and methodological quality and, where appropriate, its contribution to the theme of the Monographic section.

As detailed criteria for the review of the articles, when appropriate, the following are to be considered: adequacy of the title; adequacy of the abstract; adequacy of the key words; clarity and legibility, structure, bibliographic references; up-to-date review of the state of the art and theoretical background and contributions; originality, quality and adequacy of other technical-scientific aspects of the work (depending on the nature of the work: research, report, essay or experience); design of the work (depending on its nature; if applicable, population and sample); perspectives, methods and techniques of information collection and analysis; results (presentation, discussion and analysis); prospective (whether or not explained by the authors); illustrations, graphs and tables (suitability, sufficiency, clarity); limitations (whether or not expressed by the authors) and conclusions (adjustment to the problem and objectives, relevance, sufficiency).

The journal will update every four years on its website the list of the reviewers who have contributed to the review of its contents during that period, without establishing any link between the reviewers and the articles or the issue of the journal. Likewise, the statistics of articles received, rejected and published, and of the geographical origin of the latter, including the last ten issues published, will be updated annually.