Ver: 09.2025

GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEWERS AND ONLINE PLATFORM USER MANUAL

SITdA
Società Italiana della Tecnologia dell'Architettura

FIRENZE UNIVERSITY PRESS

INDEX

1. PRESENTATION

Dear Reviewer,

we thank you for agreeing to dedicate your time to our Journal.

TECHNE Journal, in accordance with the mission entrusted to it by SITdA in order to offer a reliable service to the scientific community, considers the contribution of the Reviewers essential as:

- contributes to guaranteeing rigorous scientific standards in the process of selection of articles worth to be published;
- supports the integrity of the Journal by identifying inadequate contributions to publication, providing suggestions for the improvement of articles to be published and thus helping to raise the quality of the journal.

Therefore, we invite you to **carefully read this document before starting the review activity**, as it contains the **guidelines** for carrying out the review activity, also in relation to the **ethical principles** adopted by our publisher (FUP) and by the TECHNE Journal, as well as the **instructions for an easy and correct use of the FUP Online Platform**.

2. GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEWERS

2.1. Cultural and scientific profile and purpose of the Journal

TECHNE, Journal of Technology for Architecture and Environment, founded in December 2010, is the official open access scientific journal of the Italian Society of Architectural Technology (SITdA).

In line with the statutory objectives of SITdA, TECHNE represents a nationally and internationally accredited critical observatory for theoretical reflection, scientific comparison, development, dissemination and exchange of knowledge, methodologies and experiences on the topics of innovation of technological and environmental design methods and tools.

TECHNE falls within the field of scientific publications with a precise cultural positioning on the topics of the architectural project, basing its statutes on the complexity of the multidisciplinary inputs that contribute to the construction of architecture and to the eco-systemic regeneration of habitats.

The objective of TECHNE is to have an effective and proactive social role in the promotion and dissemination of cognitive advances and theoretical, research methodological and operational acquisitions, including their transferability to the real context of projects, works, infrastructures and services production.

To this end, **TECHNE selects the articles for publication through a Call for Abstract** which guides the contents of critical observation and research practices for the project rooted in the social demand and its productive and institutional context. Through the Calls, TECHNE promotes innovative and multidisciplinary reflections and experimentations for quality projects and works, for technological innovation and for the protection, regeneration and enhancement of the built environment.

The evaluation process is rigorous and transparent (traceable ex post when evaluating the quality of scientific publications) and it is divided into two phases (selection of abstracts and subsequent double-blind peer review of articles).

The published articles are grouped into two sections that collect respectively different typologies of contributions: Essays and Viewpoints and Research and Experimentation.

The Authors belong to academia and research, industry, company and structures of public and private clients.

The evaluation process is rigorous and transparent (traceable ex post when evaluating the quality of scientific publications) and **it is structured into two phases**:
- the first phase concerns the **abstracts submission**, which are made anonymous by the Editorial Staff and then evaluated and selected by the Editorial Board and the Assistant Editors;
- in the second phase, the **articles** sent by the Authors whose abstracts have been selected are made anonymous by the Editorial Staff and subjected to a **double-blind peer review process**.

The cultural and scientific profile and the aims of the TECHNE Journal are illustrated on the website of the Journal itself, on the About the Journal page available at this link https://oaj.fupress.net/index.php/techne/about, where the following information can also be found:

- Structure of the Journal
- Ethical values
- Quality Committee of the Journal and its publications
- Abstracts selection and double-blind peer review process
- Just Accepted Article
- Open Access Policy
- How to publish
- Copyright
- Article Processing Charge (APC)
- Publication Frequency
- Indexing
- Corrections and Retractions / Withdrawals
- Legal Deposit
- Personal Data Protection

The procedures and evaluation and selection criteria of the two phases are described in the documents "GUIDELINES AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS" and "GUIDELINES FOR WRITING THE ARTICLE, INSTRUCTIONS FOR USING THE PLATFORM AND EDITORIAL INSTRUCTIONS" published on the Journal's website at this link https://oaj.fupress.net/index.php/techne/about/submissions.

2.2. Ethical Values

TECHNE is based on the following values:

- promoting sustainability, in all its forms, in the transformation of buildings and environment, disseminating contributions whose outcomes and repercussions are of interest in terms of cultural, socio-economic, environmental and technological impact;
- increasing the quality and rigor of the scientific production, disseminating original, significant, responsible, accurate and independent contributions, adequately supported by theoretical and/or methodological reflections, as well as by experiences and research activities carried out in the cultural, technical-scientific and operating fields;
- carrying on a consolidated cultural tradition of openness to the scientific debate in a multidisciplinary perspective, for the advancement of knowledge, methods and tools, dialoguing with the international and national scientific community;

– recognizing and enhancing the contributions for publication according to the criteria of the scientific and academic research evaluation, as defined at national and international level. To this end, TECHNE is indexed according to international criteria (ISI, Thomson JCR and SCImago Journal Rank -SJR- indicator on Scopus) and aligned with the indications of ANVUR and CUN for the evaluation of research products.

All the Editorial Team (Board, Assistant Editor, Staff), the Scientific Commission and the Reviewers refer to shared ethical values that conform their behavior according to principles of fairness and impartiality, with full transparency of the qualitative and cultural selection processes of the contributions for publication, whether they are presented by SITdA members, by scholars of Architectural technology or by other figures.

The affiliation, gender identity, religious and political orientations of the Authors or other variables independent of the quality of the content cannot be a reason for prejudice or foreclosure in the evaluation. All evaluations (abstract selection and double-blind peer review process) are carried out strictly anonymously, based exclusively on the scientific quality, originality, relevance of the presented contributions and their relevance to the issues proposed by the Journal.

Starting from issue no. 32, before being sent to reviewers, all articles are subjected to a plagiarism check by the Editorial Board, using the Crossref Similarity Check service provided by FUP.

The rules of ethical behavior and the related monitoring procedures published on the Journal website are constantly updated and aligned with international guidelines and ethical standards, such as:

– Publishing Ethics Resource Kit for editors, Elsevier
(http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/editorshome.editors/Introduction);
– Taylor & Francis/Routledge Journal Editor Code of Conduct
(https://editorresources.taylorandfrancis.com/welcome-to-tf/policies-guidelines/editor-code-of-conduct/#);
– Committee on Pubblicazione Ethics (COPE) Guidelines
(https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Guidelines).

In particular, **TECHNE asks to its Reviewers to sign an Agreement in which the Reviewer declares to abide by the following ethical guidelines**:

– evaluate each article impartially, judging on the basis of intellectual and scientific merit, according to the criteria set out in the Review Form; personal criticisms, or criticisms based on the Auditor's political or social opinions are not acceptable;
– if, reading an article, the Reviewer recognize the Author, he is still obliged to express an objective, impartial and scientifically founded judgment, evaluating the contribution regardless of race, religion, nationality, sex, gender, seniority or institutional affiliation of the Author himself;
– state any potential conflict of interest, considering any possible aspect that could potentially affect the review, and, if so, not agree to review the article;
– keep the review process confidential, not informing other people about which articles they have referenced and not sharing in any way the information received and the contents of the article with people outside the review process, without the prior authorization of the publisher; at the end of the procedure, the Reviewers should destroy all copies of the article (digital and / or printed) and the Review Form;
– provide a constructive, complete, substantiated and adequately motivated peer review report;
– during the review, avoid making statements that could be construed as damaging the reputation of any person;

- make every reasonable effort to send the Review Form by the deadline indicated, promptly reporting any delay to the Editorial Staff.

In the event that the Reviewer identifies the author's misconduct with reference to the following evidence:

- the contents of the article and / or the search results are not reliable,
- the contents of the article and / or the research results have been previously published elsewhere, without adequate cross-references, authorization or justification,
- plagiarism,

these criticalities must be highlighted in the Review Form. Following the appropriate investigations and feedback, the Director and Editor in Chief of TECHNE will formalize the acceptance or rejection of the article in a motivated manner.

2.3.   Plagiarism Check

Starting from Issue No. 32, all articles are subjected to a plagiarism check by the Editorial Board before being sent to reviewers, using the Crossref Similarity Check service provided by FUP. Should a member of the Board detect instances of plagiarism at this stage, they shall notify the Primary Contact of the identified issues, request appropriate revisions to make the text suitable for publication, and simultaneously inform the Director, the Editor-in-Chief, and the Editorial Manager.

The Board member who raised the concern is responsible for verifying that the Primary Contact complies with the request within the specified timeframe and reports the outcome to the Director, the Editor-in-Chief, and the Editorial Manager for further processing. If the plagiarism issues are resolved, the article proceeds to the double-blind peer-review process; if the Primary Contact fails to comply within the given timeframe, the article is excluded from publication.

In any case, reviewers are also required to report any suspected plagiarism by completing the "Questions to the Reviewer" section of the Review Form, ticking the box "Did you detect plagiarism?" and providing an explanation in the "Comments for Editors (will not be revealed to authors)" field.

The Editorial Staff checks for such reports and communicates them to the Board member responsible for verifying the authors' compliance with reviewers' recommendations. This Board member then contacts the Primary Contact to report the identified issues and request revisions to make the article suitable for publication, while also informing the Director, the Editor-in-Chief, and the Editorial Manager.

The Board member who made the report verifies that the Primary Contact fulfils the request within the indicated timeframe and informs the Director, the Editor-in-Chief, and the Editorial Manager of the outcome. If the reviewers' recommendations have been properly implemented and the plagiarism issues resolved, the article is approved for publication; otherwise, if the Primary Contact fails to comply within the specified timeframe, the article is excluded from publication.

2.4.   The review process

The Journal TECHNE assume a **Double-Blind Peer Review process** which guarantees the **anonymity of the Authors and Reviewers** (all recognizable references are eliminated from the article). On the Journal website, a list of Reviewers is annually published and updated. The names of the Reviewers are not attributable to the individual articles evaluated (link https://oaj.fupress.net/index.php/techne/rev). This process aims to achieve **transparency** of review process and to **recognize the contribution provided by the Reviewers** who, with their opinions and suggestions, contribute to improving both the quality of the articles and the Journal.

The Editorial Staff anonymizes the articles uploaded to the FUP Platform by the Authors. All particulars or details, attributable to the author, are removed from the article.

The Editor in Chief, with the support of the Editorial Staff, assigns each article to two expert Reviewers, identified within a list of TECHNE Reviewers, on the basis of their specific skills with respect to the topics treated by the article (keywords and research interests).

The list of Reviewers includes independent scholars and / or researchers, who belong to the national and international scientific / academic community. The members of the Editorial Board, Assistant Editors and the Editorial Staff are excluded by the list of Reviewers.

The Reviewers' assignment procedure, verifies the **absence of conflicts of interest**, checking, in particular, that the Reviewers:

- do not belong to the same institutions of authors of the article;
- are not authors of abstracts or articles submitted for the TECHNE issue subject to the review process.

TECHNE also requests to Reviewers to sign of an Agreement on ethical values of the Journal.

Each Reviewer receives an e-mail invitation to review one or two articles, with the anonymous abstract attached and the deadlines for acceptance of the review.

Based on the abstract, the Reviewer decides whether or not to accept the review, verifying:

- that the article corresponds to their areas of expertise;
- that there are no potential conflicts of interest;
- to be able to report within the deadlines indicated by the Editorial Staff.

Within the deadline indicated by the Editorial Staff, the Reviewer is asked to communicate his decision both via e-mail to the Editorial Staff and via the FUP Platform. Compliance with this deadline is particularly important, as it allows, in case of refusal, the prompt reassignment of the article to another Reviewer. In case of refusal, the Auditor is also invited to report any other names of experts who may carry out the review of the article.

2.5.   Review procedure

The review must be carried out using the appropriate Review Form (to be downloaded and then uploaded on the FUP Platform, following the instructions in point 3 of this document) which indicates the criteria to be used, with dedicated spaces for comments, judgments, motivations and final judgment.

The **criteria** for the assessment are the following:

- congruity with the theme of the Call and the selected topic;
- scientific relevance of the addressed subject;
- innovation, originality and impact of the article;
- quality and clarity of the structure, exhaustiveness of the dissertation and language's appropriateness;
- quality and comprehensiveness of the references.

Furthermore, for the articles of the typology **Essays and Viewpoints**:

- methodological rigour and coherence of the dissertation;

and for the articles of the typology **Research and Experimentation**:

- methodological rigour and consistency between research objectives and results;
- impact, limits and potential development of the research.

In compiling the Review Form it is recommended:

- to select a judgment from the four indicated (excellent, good, sufficient, insufficient) for each criterion, motivating it in the appropriate space;

- to pay attention to the criteria specifically referred to the two different types of article (Essays and Viewpoints and Research and Experimentation), filling in these boxes on the basis of the typology of article.

The **Overall Assessment** must be expressed by ticking one of the following options:

- Accepted: the contribution is accepted for publication as is.
- Accepted with Minor Revisions: the article is accepted, but the Authors are required to carry out the minor revisions indicated.
- Reconsider after Major Revisions: the acceptance of the article is subject to the review of the text by the Authors with reference to all the points indicated by the Reviewer. The article, appropriately modified, will then have to be uploaded again to the FUP Platform. It will be the responsibility of the Editorial Board and Assistant Editors to verify that the changes made correspond to the requirements of the Reviewer in order to approve the publication.
- Rejected: the article is not acceptable for publication as it has substantial gaps, which cannot be overcome with a subsequent review by the Author.

The Overall Assessment must be appropriately motivated in the appropriate space.

If the article is accepted with **Minor Revisions** or needs to be reconsidered after **Major Revisions**, the Reviewer must promptly indicate the required revisions in the appropriate space.

Finally, the Reviewer is requested to make **any further suggestions for the Author** for improving the quality of the article and to indicate his **willingness or not to re-evaluate the Article after the changes made by the Author**.

It is recommended to fill in the form in all its parts and to pay the utmost attention in verifying the overall consistency of the assessments, motivations and final rating.

In case of conflicting evaluations between two Reviewers, in the presence of a Rejected judgment, the contribution is sent to a third Reviewer, whose evaluation is decisive for the decision on publication.

Articles that get two Rejected assessments are not accepted for publication.

By the date indicated in the Call, the Primary Contact will receive communication from the Editorial Staff about the acceptance or rejection of the article, together with the 2 or 3 anonymous Review Forms, which explain any requests for revision.

The Primary Contact is required to notify any other Authors and, if revisions are required, must re-upload the correct article to the FUP platform, within the times indicated by the Editorial Staff.

The assessments of the Reviewers and the final approval by the Editorial Board and the Assistant Editors are final and unquestionable.

Upon completion of the procedure, the Reviewer will receive communication about the final outcome of the refereeing process.

2.6.   Just Accepted Article

Since n. 24/2022, TECHNE Journal provides for the possibility of making the articles in the issue immediately available after their acceptance through the double-blind review phase, by publishing them in the form of Just Accepted Article. This method, already practiced by numerous scientific journals, allows an additional and free service to be offered to the Authors and to the entire scientific community, as it significantly accelerates the dissemination of contributions (with a fully citable format-DOI-Digital Object Identifier) compared to the longer times of publication of the complete issue.

The Editorial Board selects "Just Accepted Articles" that in the double-blind review have not received any requests for major revisions and have mostly received ratings of excellent and good (thus 4 out of 6 ratings for the "Essays and Viewpoints" category and 5 out of 7 ratings for the "Research and Experimentation" category). So, the evaluations expressed by the Reviewers get further relevance as they are **decisive for the purpose of accepting an article for publication in Just Accepted.**

2.7. Personal Data Protection

The names and e-mail addresses entered in TECHNE journal site will be used exclusively for the stated purposes of this journal and will not be made available for any other purpose or to any other party.

3. ONLINE PALTFORM USER MANUAL

3.1. How to register

To use the **ONLINE PLATFORM https://oaj.fupress.net/index.php/techne/login** you need to be logged in with a username and password.

Those who already have these credentials, on first access authors must reset the password by clicking on "Forgot your password?". They must then enter their mail and click on the "Reset password".

Those who do not already have these credentials, have to register. Once on the platform select "REGISTER" and fulfill the requested fields (Name, Surname, Affiliation, Country, mail, user name and password). At the end, Authors must select the following fields:

"☐ Yes, I agree to have my data collected and stored according to the privacy statement."

"☐ Yes, I would like to be notified of new publications and announcements."

"☐ Yes, I would like to be contacted with requests to review submissions to this journal."

After you log in, **authors must update their data**:

- click on "CONTACT" and enter your phone number;
- click on "ROLES" and select "REVIEWERS".

Please consider that the compulsory fields are those marked with *, and that the information can always be edited and updated. Nevertheless, **it is important and very useful to proceed with the compilation of all the fields**, an action that allows TECHNE to have a complete and always updated archive. Once registered, it will be possible to modify personal data and access to dedicated areas.

3.2. Article review request - Accept or decline

When a Review is assigned, the Reviewer receives an invitation via email. The Reviewer must then accept or decline the invitation (section "1. Request"), by accessing the online platform https://oaj.fupress.net/index.php/techne/login and logging in with the username and password used in phase of registration.

This leads to the home page where the title of the contribution and the abstract are visible. On this page the Reviwer can accept or reject the appointment as Reviewer. In particular:

- **if you decide to accept the assignment as Reviewer (recommended), accept the privacy agreement** by clicking on "Yes, I agree to have my data collected and stored according to the privacy statement" and then accept the assignment by clicking on "Accept Review, Continue to Step # 2".

- **if you decide NOT to accept the appointment as Reviewer**, click on "Decline Review Request".

TECHNE
Journal of Technology for Architecture and Environment

SITdA

FIRENZE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

3.3. Guidelines for the Reviewers

In section "2. Guidelines", the Reviewer by clicking on "Continue Step # 3" declares to have read and accepted the Guidelines for Reviewers contained in point 2 of the document "Guidelines for the Reviewers and Online Platform User Manual".

3.4.   Download the Article and the Review Form

In section "3. Download & Review" you can download (by clicking on the file name):

- the file of the article to be reviewed;
- the "Revision Form" file or the format of the Revision Form to be filled in to carry out the revision.

3.5.   Review Form File

Fill in all the fields of the Review Form and then upload it to the platform, on this same page, using the **Upload File** button. Before continuing, in accordance with the evaluation indicated in the loaded form, select one of the following options from the drop-down menu under **Recommendation**:

- Accept Submission
- Revisions Required
- Resubmit for Review
- Decline Submission

It is recommended not to select items other than the four listed above (therefore do not select "Resubmit Elsewhere" or "See Comments").

After this last step, the Review session is completed.

← Back to Submissions

Review:Prova

1. Request   2. Guidelines   3. Download & Review   **4. Completion**

Review Submitted

Thank you for completing the review of this submission. Your review has been submitted successfully. We appreciate your contribution to the quality of the work that we publish; the editor may contact you again for more information if needed.

Review Discussions				**Add discussion**
Name	From	Last Reply	Replies	Closed
No Items				