

## **Our Peer-Reviewing Policy** (to the public and authors)

Since our 2010 issues, we have gone from a simple/open blind peer-review simple to a *double-blind peer-reviewing system* in order to ensure the quality of our published material. Therefore, all submitted articles must be kept anonymous at all times during the reviewing process, as must the identity of the reviewers.

The reviewers are called to represent the interests of both the authors and the editors by making sure that the content and form of the articles match the highest standards in academic research and publication. Reviewing notes and suggestions must always be polite and constructive. The reviewers will be provided with a peer-reviewing protocol and a guiding worksheet with the evaluation and reviewing criteria by the editors.

We regret we are unable to accept submissions that do not observe the anonymity prerequisites outlined above.

## **UBR REVIEWING PROTOCOL** (to the reviewers)

- **UBR** uses the *double-blind peer-reviewing* system. The authors and their reviewers must be kept anonymous from one another at all times. All reviewers must observe the suggestions below on preserving anonymity. Should you encounter information that discloses the author's identity, please return the article to us and warn us about the anonymity breach so that we may invalidate the review. The entire reviewing process is strictly confidential and we urge you not to discuss it with third parties.
- We expect all comments and annotations to be constructive and respectful, and we encourage you to use a polite tone and civil style.
- All corrections, comments and suggestions will be included in the document containing the reviewed article. To preserve your anonymity as reviewer, please do the following:
  - On the **Tools** menu, click **Options**, and then click the **User Information** tab. In the **Initials** box, type the initials or name that you want to use in your own comments.
  - NOTES**  
The information you type in the **User Information** dialog box is used by all Microsoft Office programs. Therefore, any changes you make to these settings will affect other Office programs. Once you have finished reviewing the article and closed the document, do not forget to revert to the original markings in the **User Information** tab.
- Place *general* comments and suggestions at the end of the article, title them "Reviewer's comments:" and use red for your font color. (Red should come automatically if you are working in the "reviewing" mode described immediately below.)

For individual/specific comments and suggestions in the text enter VIEW > TOOLBARS > then select „Reviewing” followed by a click on the "Track Changes" icon. All corrections and insertions will be automatically in red. If you want to make a comment, click the "Insert Comment" icon. This modality also proved easier for subsequent revisions which only take a click on the “accept/reject change” icons.

- **The Final Recommendation/Ranking** (you must choose one of the three below) will be inserted both above the article title in red block letters, and in the body of your email message on returning the article to us. Your recommendation must be based on the author’s performance in each of the criteria from your *Reviewing Criteria Checklist* (the Excel Spreadsheet).
  1. **Rejected** due to
    - a) poor quality standards (general score minus 1 and below)
    - b) irrelevance for the theme of the respective issue or the field of the review, or
    - c) plagiarism / deontological issues [please insert a special mention of this above the title of the article and in your return email message].
  2. **Accepted without revisions**
  3. **Accepted with (substantial or minor ) revisions**. Please indicate if you need to see the article after its revision by the author.
- The reviewing criteria in REVIEWING CRITERIA CHECKLIST.xls are arranged in the order we suggest for your evaluation procedures. In the first column you will find guiding questions for each criterion. Please use scores from plus 3 (+3) to minus 2 (-2), thus:
  - 3 = outstanding/very good;
  - 2 = solid/decent;
  - 1 = barely acceptable/relatively OK;
  - 0 = questionable / the editors should decide / accepted with substantial revisions;
  - 1 (minus 1) = unacceptable / structural or extensive revision needed;
  - 2 (minus 2) = entirely incompatible with a prestigious or serious academic publication.

(N.B. Feel free to use half-points where you find it appropriate. Insert your marks in the respective cells in the SCORE column with the exception of the last three cells (B32-34) reserved for automated functions/averages.)

Occasional trouble with decimals in the spreadsheet could be linked to cell formatting (for instance, the program might take your scores to be calendar dates). Try highlighting the SCORE column, then enter FORMAT > CELLS menu and select the "Number" tab, then *either* "Text" (under "Category"), *or* "Number", then type 2 for "Decimal places" (if it is not already selected) and click “OK”.

Use the English [.] , not [,] to separate decimals.

**FYI:** One third of the overall score is devoted to the PARATEXT (title, keywords, abstract, intro and conclusions, bibliography, notes and references, illustrations, tables/charts) and STYLE. Two thirds go to RESEARCH MATTER: originality, complexity, in-depth analysis, relevance, potential for impacting the research field or social life, problematizing and level of commitment, coherence and solidity of the argument, the adequacy and consistency of the methodology etc.).

- Please title your documents:
  1. **[SHORT ARTICLE TITLE]\_REVIEWED#1.DOC** (for the Word document with the reviewed article and your comments) and
  2. **[SHORT ARTICLE TITLE]\_EVALUATION.XLS** (for the Excel spreadsheet with the evaluation scores)then send both attachments at the email address [UBRpublication@gmail.com](mailto:UBRpublication@gmail.com)

## REVIEWING CRITERIA CHECKLIST.xls

### REVIEWER'S CHECKLIST

- The reviewing criteria in REVIEWING CRITERIA CHECKLIST.xls are arranged in the order we suggest for your evaluation procedures. In the first column you will find guiding questions for each criterion. Please use scores from plus 3 (+3) to minus 2 (-2), thus:
  - 3 = outstanding/very good;
  - 2 = solid/decent;
  - 1 = barely acceptable/relatively OK;
  - 0 = questionable / the editors should decide / accepted with substantial revisions;
  - 1 (minus 1) = unacceptable / structural or extensive revision needed;
  - 2 (minus 2) = entirely incompatible with a prestigious or serious academic publication.

*N.B.* Feel free to use half-points where you find it appropriate. Insert your marks in the respective cells in the SCORE column with the exception of the last three cells (B32-34) reserved for automated functions/averages.

One third of the overall score is devoted to the PARATEXT (title, keywords, abstract, intro and conclusions, bibliography, notes and references, illustrations, tables/graphics) and STYLE. Two thirds go to RESEARCH MATTER: originality, complexity, in-depth analysis, relevance, potential for impacting the research field or social life, problematizing and level of commitment, coherence and solidity of the argument, the adequacy and consistency of the methodology etc.).

CRITERION DESCRIPTION	SCORE	REMARKS
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>
Does the author clarify the context of the research? Are there references to current debates on the topic/in the field? Are the objectives of this research clearly stated? Is there a convincing case for the contribution of this research to the understanding of the topic/field? Is the intro in a logical succession with the title, the body of the paper, and the conclusions?		
<b>THE ARGUMENT</b>	<b>THE ARGUMENT</b>	<b>THE ARGUMENT</b>

Is this a coherent, solid, evidence-supported argument? Is there a clear succession in the steps taken to make a case? Are the paragraphs and ideas clearly connected and appropriately arranged to point to the conclusion? Are the objectives clearly announced from the start and systematically pursued throughout the paper?		
<b>METODOLOGIE</b>	<b>METODOLOGIE</b>	<b>METODOLOGIE</b>
Does the author make use of a critical methodology which s/he clearly identifies and explains, then consistently applies throughout? Is this methodology pertinent, updated, convincing?		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>
Do they follow from the logic of the argument? Are they adequate in size and quality? Do they properly explain the results of the research, the its relevance and contribution to the topic/field? Do they indicate the new avenues made available by this research?		
<b>TITLE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>
Is it clear and of appropriate length? Is it relevant and does it adequately announce the theme or the point of the article? Does it express the polemic stance of the paper?		
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>ABSTRACT</b>
Does it adequately summarize the context, the object, and the method of this research?		
<b>KEYWORDS</b>	<b>KEYWORDS</b>	<b>KEYWORDS</b>
Are they adequate in terms of number, relevance, selection?		
<b>REFERENCES AND CRITICAL APPARATUS</b>	<b>REFERENCES AND CRITICAL APPARATUS</b>	<b>REFERENCES AND CRITICAL APPARATUS</b>

Does the author give due credit to sources and previous research on which s/he draws? Is the MLA citation style adequately used? Is the bibliography up to date and relevant? Are the notes necessary, informative and suitably sized?		
<b>TABLES, CHARTS, ILLUSTRATIONS ETC.</b>	<b>TABLES, CHARTS, ILLUSTRATIONS ETC.</b>	<b>TABLES, CHARTS, ILLUSTRATIONS ETC.</b>
Are they revealing, sufficient and clear? Do they really help the reader better understand the argument?		Lasati casuta pentru nota alba daca nu exista tabele etc.
<b>ORIGINALITY, POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT</b>	<b>ORIGINALITY, POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT</b>	<b>ORIGINALITY, POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT</b>
Does the article further the understanding of the topic/field? Does it propose innovative avenues for exploration, revise extant approaches, cover issues that have been hitherto tackled insufficiently or not at all? Is the article likely to instigate further debates and to emulate subsequent research along the lines it proposes?		
<b>RELEVANT AND INTERESTING RESEARCH TOPIC</b>	<b>RELEVANT AND INTERESTING RESEARCH TOPIC</b>	<b>RELEVANT AND INTERESTING RESEARCH TOPIC</b>
Does it tackle a topic/field that interests/might interest the scientific community today? Can the article raise interest in certain social sectors? Does it engage current debates?		
<b>COMPLEXITY AND IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS</b>	<b>COMPLEXITY AND IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS</b>	<b>COMPLEXITY AND IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS</b>

Does the article meet the complexity and span of the proposed topic/field? Does it engage the complications, ambiguities and imbrications of its proposed topic? Does it state more than the obvious and the commonplace??		
<b>STYLE, LANGUAGE, CRITICAL JARGON</b>	<b>STYLE, LANGUAGE, CRITICAL JARGON</b>	<b>STYLE, LANGUAGE, CRITICAL JARGON</b>
Does the author fully comply with the MLA style of citation? Is his/her idiom sufficiently elegant, convincing, and does it allow for nuances and fine points to be made? Is it written in correct, academic level English? Does s/he use the academic/critical jargon rigorously?		
<b>DO NOT WRITE ANYTHING BELOW!</b>		
<b>PARATEXT AVERAGE</b>	#DIV/0!	
<b>RESEARCH MATTER AVERAGE</b>	#DIV/0!	
<b>FINAL RANKING SCORE</b>	#DIV/0!	