

The Manuscripts Peer- Review Process

The peer-review process of scientific papers is often defined as critical appraisal, impartial and independent of scientific papers submitted to a journal for publication. This process constitutes an integral part of the development of scientific paper, even if it is not conducted by the author/ authors of the paper, this process provides to authors essential elements to avoid the dissemination of results and marginal opinions, without scientific value, so that a review process acts as a filter. Reviewing, as part of scientific and editorial process, encourages authors to follow and accept the standards developed by the Editorial Board, in the idea of increasing the quality of scientific papers, and consequently, to increase the „impact factor” of the publication for which the scientific paper has been submitted.

It is true that the independent peer review of scientific papers, also provides to the Editorial Board opportunities to identify poor articles and papers, from a scientific point of view. Reviewing all of scientific papers, whether they are research reports, or reviews of papers, even though these are more extensive scientific papers with a particular scientific impact, or these are scientific articles in the topics, submitted for publication in the journal “ANNALS OF THE ORADEA UNIVERSITY. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering”, is as follows: each paper is assigned by the journal’s Editor- in- Chief, towards two scientific reviewers and an editor, who are usually member of the Editorial Board of the journal. They analyzes the paper after the standard procedure developed in compliance with the regulations and guidelines with specific experience of academic publications, accepted and implemented worldwide, fill in an online report of the peer review, which is constructed as a survey, with specific entries in the messaging area towards the Editor- in- Chief.

The peer- review of of scientific papers, established by magazine “ANNALS OF THE ORADEA UNIVERSITY. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering”, is performed as a single masked, or single blind, system in which the names of the reviewers are unknown to the authors, but the names of the authors are known to reviewers and editors, and is conducted into three steps:

1. A brief paper analysis, made by the editors, members of the journal’s Editorial Board. In this stage, the journal’s editor-in - chief may decide to reject the manuscript without further submitting towards peer-review of scientific reviewers. This is argued by the lack of any scientific message of the manuscript, in accordance with readers' expectations, also which may be due to the insufficient interest in the field classifications of the journal, or may be due the scientific value which could be emphasized rather than poor. The rejection of the manuscript has also positive effects as it could be submitted to other journals, i.e. may be save time if the manuscript is no longer submitted for peer- review, where the chances of acceptance would be clearly minimal. Also the article may be reviewed and it can be seek a new submitting to the journal, with the condition that the author be aware of recommendations made by the editor- in- chief, and he should assume these. The author of the manuscript

receives, from the Journal's editor- in- chief, a message that's highly briefly motivating what is/ are the argument/ arguments for the rejection of the manuscript at this stage;

2. The allocation the manuscript for review, towards two scientific reviewers, selected by the Journal's editor- in- chief and to an editor, member of the Journal's Editorial Board. The author of the manuscript is informed through an email message, that the paper submitted was distributed for peer- review, also the author being informed that following the review process, he/ she will receive, in the shortest time, no longer than 4 weeks, the reviewers comments accompanied by their recommendations. Also, the author is advised to expect all three messages with the reviewers comments, because it will be completely and correctly informed an any necessary revisions recommendations (minor or major) of the submitted paper, in this way the revised paper will be re-submitted to the journal only once, thus while avoiding the transmission of several revised versions of the paper. Following this time peer- review paper, the reviewers issuing the recommendation for acceptance of the paper for revision (minor or major) thereof, respectively to reject the publication of the manuscript in question. The author of the manuscript receives one message on behalf of the Journal's editor- in- chief, corresponding to each reviewer, or editor assigned for peer- review process, totally three e-mails with the reviewers comments. These three messages are always checked by the Journal's editor- in- chief, in order to prevent transmission of expressions insulting the author, and to establish an honest and civilized communication with the authors. A message, the fourth message, is sent to the manuscript author, by the Journal's editor- in- chief, arguing him the decision taken following the reviewing phase: acceptance, revision, rejection. Decision is followed by guidance on the steps below:
 - In case of acceptance, authors are invited to submit the documents concerning the copyright transfer, also the statement of authorship of the paper(<http://www.imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/guide.php>);
 - In case of revision (minor or major), the author is requested to achieve amendments and adjustments, requested by the peer reviewers, after which he/ she may be redirecting revised article to the Journal. The revised article will be resubmitted, by the Journal's editor- in- chief, usually to the same peer reviewers, in order to make a new decision;
 - In case of rejection, the item is removed from the journal archive, the author being asked no longer resubmit the same article, even reformulated.
3. The peer- review process concludes at the time when Journal's editor- in- chief decides that the manuscript is accepted for publication and, following documents, have been received from the author, signed by all authors: statement of copyright transfer, the statement of the paper authorship. These documents are available on the journal website menu Guide for Authors: <http://www.imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/guide.php>.

The Journal "ANNALS OF THE ORADEA UNIVERSITY. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering", respects and encourages, with the necessary updates, following general guidelines and procedures:

- Guide to authors of the European Association of Science Editors (EASE)
<http://www.ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines>
- Guidelines of Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, Best Practice Guidelines on Publication Ethics
<http://authorservices.wiley.com/bauthor/publicationethics.asp>
- The best practices and policies of the Council of Science Editors editorial Inc. (CSE)
<http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3331>
- Ethical Guidelines for The Scientific Reviewers:
http://publicationethics.org/files/COPEEthicalGuidelines_20for_PeerReviewersDRAFT28Jan13_20for_20feedback.pdf
- Guide "Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts", developed by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, http://www.icmje.org/urm_main.html, the oldest specialized guide, the first version has been developed at the second meeting of the International Steering Committee of Medical Editors, from Montreal, February 5, 1979.
- Code of Ethics for Engineers and Scientists ("National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE) Code of Ethics for Engineers" Online Ethics Center for Engineering 7/24/2006 National Academy of Engineering Accessed: Wednesday, March 06, 2013,
www.onlineethics.org/Resources/ethcodes/EnglishCodes/9972.aspx)
- The Reviewer Guidelines: Sara Rockwell, "Ethics of Peer Review: A Guide for Manuscript Reviewers' Departments of Therapeutic Radiology and Pharmacology, and the Office of Scientific Affairs, Yale University School of Medicine, PO Box 208040, New Haven, CT 06510-8040 (<http://ori.dhhs.gov/sites/default/files/prethics.pdf>)

Note: Against the decision of the Journal's editor-in-chief, following the peer review process of the paper submitted for publication, authors may appeal, addressing complaints. These complaints will be treated in accordance with Editorial Board procedure, posted on Journal website.