

The Responsibilities of Scientific Reviewers

The peer- review process shall be the main mechanism by which the scientific research quality is assessed and accepted. The most significant decisions in science, just as the academic progress scientists is based on peer reviewed publications. Whereas the number of scientific papers published each year, is steadily increasing, the quality of the peer review and editorial quality of scientific committees, are primarily considered, as have the greatest influence on the reputation of a journal, also on the impact factor in the field by position incidence.

Publication of peer reviewed articles, in scientific journals, depends on the utmost by of scientific reviewers, who make available its own time and professional expertise for this operation. In most of the cases, evaluating a manuscript is requested by two scientific reviewers, but, by statistical organization reasons, sometimes three reviewers are asked to evaluate the same paper. Sometimes there are cases where differences between the reviewers recommendations, and value appreciation of a paper, is so different as the editor is required to request further review. This could come from one editor, member of the Editorial Board of the journal. One situation more uncommon is that when required more than three reviewers, which is the case of a multidisciplinary papers and various scientific opinions of other people is mandatory.

If it summarizes the qualities and the obligations of a reviewer, results that it is responsible toward authors, publishers and readers.

1. The responsibilities of scientific reviewers towards authors

- The reviewer shall provide to the author, within a timely period of time, a written report regarding to the paper scientific value, this report provides a recommendation, according to the objectively reviewer opinion;
- Provides to the author written directions, clear and concise, and relevant information on paper classification, paper authenticity, originality and characterizes its paper according to the potential readers' interest;
- The scientific reviewers comments and criticism does not personal targeted, relative to the authors;
- The scientific reviewer respects the confidentiality of peer- review process: does not communicate and do not disclose to a third party information related to the reviewed paper;

2. The responsibilities of the scientific reviewers towards editors

- The reviewer commits to inform the editor in a timely manner, if he's not available for reviewing the paper and propose a different scientific reviewer;
- If a potential conflict of interests, personal or financial, arise, reviewer declines invitation to review the paper, informing promptly to the editor, so that it decide;
- The reviewer shall undertake to comply with the written instructions of the editor, regarding the objectives, and the review process content and quality.

- The scientific reviewers comments and remarks, with regard to the reviewed work, are well thought, fair, constructive and well-argued;
- Due to personal expertise, the reviewer is able to determine the scientific value of the reviewed paper, to ascertain the degree of originality of the work, and the scope of its content, indicating the ways to increase the paper quality, recommending acceptance or refusal based on questionnaire assessment, made available on the journal website;
- The ethical considerations, observed by the reviewer, are promptly brought to the attention of journal's editor-in- chief;
- The reviewer refrains from any communication with reviewed paper author.

3. Responsibilities of the scientific reviewers towards readers

- The reviewer shall ensure as far, in deference for himself and for the readers, that the manuscript has been scientifically reviewed, properly assessed, the value of studies and research presented in this paper are apparent, and at any time, the reader, may replicate this study using outlined methods;
- While respecting the assessment procedure, the reviewer shall ensure that all relevant papers, of other scientists, in the area covered by the reviewed paper, were properly cited.