Most Important Issues for Scientific Reviewer

There are some basic requirements that acknowledged scientific personality in one of the areas covered by the Journal "ANNALS OF THE ORADEA UNIVERSITY. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering", which has agreed to become the journal's scientific referent, must accept and to apply them throughout the course of scientific reviewing process:

1. **Honestly self-evaluation**

If you received a request in order for reviewing scientific works should be carried out by the scientific referent, a pre-evaluation of the situation, to answer the following questions:

a. *Article, which you have been invited to review, really fit in your specific expertise?*
   - It should be taken into consideration that the the editor who assigned the paper for reviewing, could not be aware, in detail, what reviewer's concerns.

b. *Do you have time required to evaluate scientific the paper?*
   - A paper peer- review process, could be a time consuming operation. Usually, it is considered that approximately three hours is a reasonable period of time for completion the entire process of peer review. If the Editorial Board of the journal has not specified a deadline for submitting the review report, it is considered, mutual agreement, to be acceptable, the reviewer appreciation the time limits to meet. If there is no security of time framing, within a reasonable time limits, the reviewer should be announces to the Journal's editor in chief, both on an expected term, as well as an eventual review refusal.

2. **The management of peer- review process**

a. *The confidentiality of reviewing process*
   - The manuscript, received for evaluation, can not be disseminated in any way to another person, journals, etc.(http://www.icmje.org/ethical_5privacy.html).
   - If a reviewer want to know an additional view, of another scientific personalities, there is a moral obligation, that prior inform the Journal's editor- in- chief about this intention, for it to take all necessary measures, in order to keep confidentiality of the peer-reviewing process. Furthermore, unless otherwise specified in the editor message towards reviewer, the reviewer identity disclosure is not allowed. Usually, it is counterproductive that the reviewer to contact the manuscript author. When drawn observations and comments, in the "Comments"- field of the questionnaire, which is done online on the journal website, should be considered that all of these (survey observations and comments in the "Comments" field) contribute essentially to the the decision making by the editors.

b. *Impartiality and integrity of the reviewer*
   - A review paper is issuing conclusions and comments always based on objective and impartial consideration, excluding personal or professional intolerance. The reviewer comments are always based only on the scientific value of the work, the originality and quality of writing, and also on how this work relates to the purpose and mission of the journal, excluding any reference to race, ethnic origin, religion or author's nationality.
   - Scientific referent should not consider that he deserves benefits, kind of scientific, financial or personal by the editors or, even more, from the author, as result of reviewing process. If a reviewer considers that

there is a potential conflict of interest, he/ she must decline the invitation to review that manuscripts, and communicate this immediately to the editor-in- chief.

c. *The reviewer is a constructive critic*

- The reviewer observations should reveal positive aspects of the reviewed manuscript, should identify, in a constructive manner, the negative aspects and identify necessary improvements. These are extremely useful for authors, because they form an accurate picture of inside about how it is viewed from outside of submitted manuscript. A reviewer have to explain and to logically and coherently support all critical observations so that both, the author and the editor, could understand precisely the essence of comments and criticisms expressed.
- The invitation to review a scientific paper does not aim to demonstrate the ability of a reviewer to identify defects and lack of conformity. Reviewer has the responsibility to reveal the strengths of the paper and to provide constructive feedback to help the author to solve its weaknesses.
- Even though the reviews are confidential, all comments, otherwise anonymous, should be respectfully. Sometimes reviewer may decide to send two sets of ratings, one for author, and the other one, for editor. Into the second rating message, sent to editor, the reviewer having the opportunity to speak more freely about the scientific value of work, recommending rejection or acceptance of the work (in other words, an opinion less argued, or reasoned argument can not be serious, it is good to reach just to editor).

d. *The reviewer competence*

- If a reviewer established that, into the area, falling papers received for review, has limited competence, if any, shall be moral and professional obligation to decline that invitation reviewing the paper by immediately informing the Journal's editor- in- chief. A reviewer should not be expert, in all areas affected by the content of the article received, but it must accept an invitation only if it has the appropriate expertise to carry out the properly assessment of the scientific paper. If a reviewer does not have the necessary expertise to evaluate a manuscript, from scientific point of view, there is a risk that accepting a manuscript with substantially deficiencies and nonconformities, or to recommend rejection of a valuable works.

e. *The originality of the scientific paper*

- When a reviewer evaluating a manuscript, actually, are sought for answers to the following questions: there is sufficiently new and interesting the article is to warrant publication? Article constitutes an added value to the known values of science and its principles? The manuscript meets the journal standards? The problem, proposed to be solved, the research described in this paper, is an important issue? To answer to these questions, a scientific referent must use the facilities of search engines, dedicated to the idea of comparative assessment of article reviewed. In many journals there are limitations of the percentage of novelty which seeks the assessment and classification the article, from this perspective. After this comparative assessment, reviewer is able to submit to Journal's editor- in- chief, clear references on the article degree of subject matter coverage.

f. *The paper structure*

- The reviewer have to evaluate the structural organization of the article, namely, the manner in which they are covered by sections indicated being necessary, in the overall structure of the scientific article. These specifications are retrieved in the instructions for authors: http://www.imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/ guide.php (namely at the link http://www.imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/download/Template.doc). It is looking if the key elements of the overall structure are found in the reviewed manuscript: *Title, Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Methodology, Results, Conclusion, References*:
  - *Title*: descriptive for sufficiently scientific article?
  - *Abstract*: emphasizes, briefly the content of Article?
  - *Keywords*: There are these keywords and complies with the rules broadly acceptable. Examples of keywords, devoted, is given on page: http://www.ieee.org/documents/2009Taxonomy_v101.pdf. These keywords are used to identify, rapidly, by search engines, the paper, or references on it.
  - *Introduction*: here the author/ authors should describe, quite accurately, what he wants to achieve, how solving the proposed issue, and determines as precisely as research has performed. Basically in the *Introduction* the author makes a synopsis of relevant researches, in the the context of submitted article, explaining, usually, how, other authors, had managed, as possibly, to elucidate same issue, or the extent by which they have reached to solving the same problem. Here the experiment is described and are assumptions presented also the experimental aspects of the project, or the method used.
  - *Methodology used*: The reviewer, must clearly identify the elements of the description of the method used by the author, and how they obtained results that acquired data. The project design is acceptable for its intended purpose? There is sufficient information so that project work or the research to be replicated? There are identifiable all the procedures followed by the author/ authors? Wherever they exist, are they ranked in a comprehensible terms manner and easier to follow? If the method is new, is this sufficiently detailed presented? The materials and equipments are acceptable described? The author provides a detailed description of data collected type, or whether it describes how to conduct measurements.
  - *Results*: Here the author/ authors should explain, in detail, using a common language, what was found by carrying out research outlined in the article. This presentation must be logically and clear connected. Reviewer should assess whether analysis undertaken, in this section of the scientific paper, is adequate and properly completed. Statistics are correct? If statistics is not a strong point of the reviewer, it shall notify the editor of this issue. Interpretation of results does not include usually in this section.
  - *Conclusion / Discussion*: In this section,the reviewer identify whether, the allegations are supported by the results, and if they are reasonable. Here the author must indicate clearly whether the results are correlated with expectations, or earlier researches in this field. The reviewer checks whether the article contradicts or supports established theories. Here, is explained by the author/ authors, whether the research offers added value to science?
  - *References*: One check whether elaboration of the manuscript is complied with standards, clearly specified by the Editorial Board of the journal, on guidelines and instructions for authors: http://www.imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/download/Template.doc

g. *The quality of the grammar writing*
   - It is to reviewer recommended that in case of large lacunae of expression in the English language or of multiple grammar identified errors, to warn the editor- in- chief of the Journal, which is, often, a reason why the paper's rejected.

h. *The quality of figures and tables*
   - Reviewer must verify whether figures and tables are clear and consistent, namely that accurately describe presented data. One check whether same units, that describe same data type, are used in all figures. Is identified whether the manuscript meets required standards in the drafting model (Template), required by the Editorial Board and posted on the site: http://www.imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/download/Template.doc;

i. *Previous researches and the recent works*
   - If the manuscript is developed based on previous researches, they must be clearly cited as references. The cited papers must be declared in accordance with the instructions for authors: http://www.imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/download/Template.doc;

j. *Ethical issues*
   - This part of the review process is extremely sensitive, so shall to be very carefully considered. In Romania, is in force, Law no. 206 of 27 May 2004 relating to good conduct scientific research, technological development and innovation, text into force starting with 5 September 2011. Complexity of publication ethics issues has led us to approach this delicate issue from several points of view (http://authorservices.wiley.com/bauthor/publicationethics.asp (Graf C, Wager E, Bowman A et al. Int J Clin Pract 2007; 61 [s152] 0.1 to 26); http://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors.pdf), with the stated purpose to cover, as possible as, the entire range of possible situations, in the idea to avoid any unforeseen circumstances. Reviewer should not be transformed into researcher of the moral identity of the author, but there are some very good ideas which have to be pointed, in order to avoid any contradictions there may factual issues and misunderstandings.

   - **National Science Foundation** (NSF) from USA, (http://www.nsf.gov/oig/resmisreg.pdf) provides and aply following definitions for major offenses to the ethical publication of reported research:

     (a) ***Research misconduct*** means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing or performing research (...).
     (b) ***Fabrication*** means making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
     (c) ***Falsification*** means manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
     (d) ***Plagiarism*** means the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results or words without giving appropriate credit.
     (e) ***Research***, for purposes of paragraph (a) of this section, includes proposals submitted to NSF in all fields of science,

engineering, mathematics, and education and results from such proposals.

(f) ***Research misconduct*** does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

- The Council of Science Editors and its Editorial Policy Committee had elaborate the CSE's White Paper on Promoting Integrity in Scientific Journal Publications, 2012 Update, *(Authorship: Christine Laine took the lead in writing this section of the white paper on behalf of the CSE Editorial Policy Committee. Christine Laine revised this section for the 2009 Update. Gene Snyder and Heather Goodell revised this section for the 2012 Update. Members of the Editorial Policy Committee and the CSE Board of Directors reviewed and commented on it. This section was formally approved by the CSE Board Directors on March 30, 2012.)***,** which contains important definitions of other offenses on ethical issues, such as:
  - *"Falsification and Fabrication of Data*-Perhaps the most blatant and easy to define (although not always easy to detect) form of research misconduct is investigators' fabrication or falsification of data. Fabrication refers to the invention, recording, or reporting of data. Falsification refers to the alteration of research materials, equipment, protocols, data, or results. Fabrication and falsification are two points along a spectrum, but both are serious forms of misconduct because they result in a scientific record that does not accurately reflect observed truth. Sample correspondence is available on the CSE website.
  - *Piracy and Plagiarism*-
    - *Piracy* is defined as the unauthorized reproduction or use of ideas, data, or methods from others without adequate permission or acknowledgment. Again, deceit plays a central role in this form of misconduct. The intent of the perpetrator is the untruthful portrayal of the ideas or methods as his or her own.
    - *Plagiarism* is a form of piracy that involves the unauthorized use or close imitation of the language (figures images or tables) and thoughts of others and the representation of them as one's own original work without permission or acknowledgment by the author of the source of these materials. Plagiarism generally involves the use of materials from others, but can apply to researchers' duplication of their own previously published reports without acknowledgment (this is sometimes called self-plagiarism or duplicate publication)."

- Following usefull definitions underlined by the Editorial Board of journal "ANNALS OF THE ORADEA UNIVERSITY. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering":
  - *Paraphrasing*: reviewer may suspect an attempt of masked plagiarism by rearranging text by

an author of a section of another work, which could be considered plagiarism whether the text section exceeds 10% of full text of the original paper. In this case, the reviewer warns journal's editor- in- chief, which is able to make the right decision.

- *Plagiarism*-whether the reviewer suspects that an article is an obvious copy of another work (by the same author, or another author), then there is an editor-in- chief priority to be warned. In no circumstances, on suspicion of plagiarism issues, shall contact the author. Motivation of suspicion shall be made by reference to the original work, in the report to the editor- in- chief, accurate as possible. Also plagiarism shall be considered whether a manuscript contains figures or tables copied from other works without these acknowledgment containing citations or reference to the ownership to another person.
- *Self plagiarism:* The Journal "ANNALS OF THE ORADEA UNIVERSITY. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering", requires to authors who submit papers for publication, to sign and send a copyright transfer statement (http://www.imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/download/ Copyright% 20Statement.pdf), through which the corresponding author declares that the paper has not been published in the same form, and is not in the process of being published elsewhere. If previous publication of the results of the same research exists, than the author must declare it, specifying the respective reference.
- *Copying ad literam:* If a scientific text is copied verbatim from another work (of the same author or of another author), this must be placed between quotes, otherwise it shall be considered plagiarism and is treated accordingly.
- *Fraud:* Reviewer should not determine who is the fraud, the reviewer should communicate to the editor in chief where it is suspected such an offense.

k. Details of how to handle ethical issues published, and instructions for referees are on the site: http://publicationethics.org/files/COPEEthicalGuidelines_%20for_PeerReviewersDRAFT28Jan13_%20for_%20feedback.pdf.

3. The reviewer report to the Journal's editor in chief

The Journal ""ANNALS OF THE ORADEA UNIVERSITY. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering"does not requires a detailed review report, to the reviewer, in the present procedure.

Review procedure is implemented online:

- By completing a questionnaire which provided sections that defines aspects of the scientific value of the article, structure issues, namely issues related to the scientific impact of the manuscript;
- By completing a dedicated additional comments field, where reviewer may transmit to the author, in detail, what are the issues identified, which are nonconformities, which are the revisions major/ minor, necessary to reinstate the review process.

All comments must be justified by detailed explanations. Also, the recommendation given by the reviewer must be motivated and outlined in detail for editors, also for authors, they to be able to answer at respectively reviewers comments.

Review process can be repeated as long as the editor in chief decides that the paper reviewed is not sufficiently well adapted to the journal standards. The reviewer can quit to review a paper that has been already reviewed on it.