

Peer Review Process

Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis. Series Historica (SUCSH)

The primary aims of peer review are two-fold: to decide whether or not an article should be published (based on quality and relevance to the journal), and to improve the article before publication.

Internal Peer Review Process:

All submissions first go through an internal peer review process. Each submission is reviewed by the editor assigned by the editorial secretary who makes an initial decision to send the manuscript out for peer review or to reject it without external review. Articles can be rejected at this stage for a variety of reasons such as similarity with a recently published article, the topic is outside of the scope of the *SUCSH*, little new information is provided, important flaws in the scientific validity, or an unprofessional presentation. This process normally takes two-three weeks. If the editor believes the article may be of interest to our readers, it is then sent out for external peer review.

External Peer Review Process:

The editors, upon consulting the editorial board, identify potential reviewers based on their expertise in the field, rigor and scientific methodology. Two reviewers are thus identified for each submitted manuscript. The reviewers are selected from our database reviewers whose past contributions recommend them by their quality reviews and who fit into the time frame.

Potential reviewers are contacted by the editorial secretary about their availability and interest in reviewing. Inquiries to reviewers are sent by e-mail, which include the manuscript abstract and the assignment deadline. When prospective reviewers agree to serve, they are permitted access to the manuscript and reviewing instructions, without however being permitted to know the author(s)' name. The reviewers' names are also unknown to manuscript author(s). Reviewers send their assessment to *SUCSH*. The time frame for making their decision is maximum three months. Upon reviewers' recommendations, the manuscript can be accepted, sent back to the author for minor revisions, respectively to be resubmitted or rejected.

The Editor's Decision:

The assessments from the reviewers obtained, the editor assigned to the manuscript makes a judgment that takes into consideration the critiques and recommendations from the peer reviewers, relevance, and usefulness to researchers, professors and other likely interested readers. Editors consult with one another in the process. In the end, the editor and the editorial staff decide based on the reviews and the assigned editor recommendations whether an article will be published, rejected or postponed for the next issue. We also take into account the number of manuscripts in the queue to be published as well as our opinion that the paper can be suitably revised. The authors will be announced by the editorial secretary upon this decision in due time.

REVIEWING FORM

Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis. Series Historica

No.

Year

Reviewer:

REVIEWED ARTICLE:

The reviewer's comment

1. Title of the article, abstract and keywords

2. Figures/illustrations, pictures, tables, charts, documents

3. Originality/Authenticity of the paper

4. Scientific correctness/rectitude

5. Language clearness

6. Article's length

7. Conclusions/opinions

8. Other suggestions/proposals

|

Please select one of the three options:

A. The publication of the study is recommended	
B. It is proposed that the study should be revised	
C. It is proposed that the study should be rejected	