

Double-Blind Peer Review System

Articles submitted to RBGG are evaluated in two stages. The first stage (screening) is carried out by the journal's editorial assistants, who assess the article's relevance to the RBGG scope, originality, significance of its topic, article structure, and compliance with the journal's guidelines. At this stage, articles may be rejected or may proceed to the evaluation process.

In the second stage, articles that move forward in the evaluation process are sent for peer review (double-blind system). We randomly invite three experts in the subject area to review the article, attaching to the invitation a form that guides the reviewer's assessment.

Reviewer Form.

Based on criteria established by the Editorial Committee, this form follows the formal structure of scientific work recommended by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) and serves as an important evaluation tool for us.

It contains the analyses of ad hoc reviewers, indicating whether the article is relevant to the field of Geriatrics and Gerontology, whether the work has a solid theoretical foundation, and whether the method used is appropriate and clearly described.

The reviewer must evaluate the article through ScholarOne, an internationally recognized electronic system that processes article submissions by authors and manages the review and evaluation workflow. The reviewer's evaluation of the article is submitted via the system and sent directly to the RBGG team.

Should the reviewer identify a conflict of interest regarding the article under evaluation, they will be unable to assess the text, and the manuscript will be forwarded to another ad hoc reviewer.

The authors' names are not disclosed at any point during the article's review process. The reviewer's name may, however, be disclosed to the author of the article should the reviewer choose to identify themselves.

RBGG receives the reviews, analyzes the article, and decides whether the manuscript will be recommended for publication without revisions, recommended for publication subject to revisions, or not recommended for publication. In the event of conflicting reviews, the Scientific Editor may request an additional ad hoc review.

Once the ad hoc reviews are received, the Scientific Editor evaluates the article's originality, methodological rigor, relevance/social responsibility, and writing quality. Comments on the preprint version of the article are taken into consideration in the preparation of the final decision.

Publication conditional on revisions may require several rounds of article reformulation, which will be requested from the authors. As a final outcome, articles may be recommended for publication or rejection by the Scientific Editor. The final decision rests with the Editor-in-Chief of the Journal.

Thus, we present the double-blind peer review process of RBGG.