

Guidelines for Reviewers of *ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE*

General Policies and Procedures

Authors submit their manuscripts electronically via e-mail. Each manuscript is reviewed by RJTI staff for relevancy to the individual journal. The manuscript is assigned to an editor, who in turn chooses one or more editorial board members or ad hoc reviewers to review it.

On receipt of the invitation to review, you should immediately:

- Read the editor's transmittal e-mail, which includes the article abstract, to determine whether the subject is within your area of expertise and whether you can complete the review in the stated time period.
- Click the link in the e-mail and either accept or decline the invitation to review.

If you decline the invitation to review:

- Indicate why you are declining.
- If possible, please suggest a colleague who may be able to review the manuscript. If appropriate, the editor will send an invitation to review to that individual. You may not "transfer" your invitation to review the manuscript to a colleague.

If you accept the invitation to review, you will have access to the complete PDF of the manuscript and should immediately:

- Double-check the manuscript title page and the Acknowledgments section to determine whether there is any conflict of interest for you (with the authors, their

institution, or their funding sources) and whether you can judge the article impartially.

- Quickly skim the relevant portions of the manuscript and verify that it fits within the scope of the journal.

If you have either a time problem or a conflict of interest, contact the editor in chief for instructions. He/she may extend your deadline or cancel the review assignment as appropriate. If your cursory examination reveals that the manuscript does not fit within the scope of the journal, indicate that in the Review Form.

Do not discuss the paper with its authors either during or after the review process. Although it may seem natural and reasonable to discuss points of difficulty or disagreement directly with an author, especially if you are generally in favor of publication and do not mind revealing your identity, this practice is prohibited because the other reviewers and the editor may have different opinions, and the author may be misled by having "cleared things up" with the reviewer who contacted him/her directly.

The manuscript provided to you for review is a privileged document. Please protect it from any form of exploitation. Do not cite a manuscript or refer to the work it describes before it has been published and do not use the information that it contains for the advancement of your own research or in discussions with colleagues.

In your comments intended for the author, do not make statements about the acceptability of a paper (see the next paragraph); suggested revisions should be stated as such and not expressed as conditions of acceptance. Organize your review so that an introductory paragraph summarizes the major findings of the article, gives your overall impression of the paper, and highlights the major shortcomings. This paragraph should be followed by specific, numbered comments, which, if appropriate, may be subdivided into major and minor points. (The numbering facilitates both the editor's letter to the author and evaluation of the author's rebuttal.) Criticism should be presented dispassionately; offensive remarks are not acceptable.

Confidential remarks directed to the editor should be entered in the box so labeled. Advise the editor of your recommendation for acceptance, modification, or rejection by making the appropriate selection in the dropdown menu. The final decision regarding modification, acceptance, or rejection of a manuscript rests solely with the editor in chief, so do not state your recommendation in the portion of the review that will be sent to the author.

The Review

Adopt a positive, impartial, but critical attitude toward the manuscript under review, with the aim of promoting effective, accurate, and relevant scientific communication.

Please consider the following aspects when reviewing a manuscript:

- Significance to the target scientific community
- Originality
- Appropriateness of the approach or experimental design
- Adherence to correct scientific nomenclature
- Appropriate literature citations
- Adequacy of experimental techniques
- Soundness of conclusions and interpretation
- Relevance of discussion
- Organization
- Adherence to the Instructions to Authors
- Adequacy of title and abstract
- Appropriateness of figures and tables

- Appropriateness of supplemental material intended for posting (if applicable)
- Length

You are not required to correct deficiencies of style, syntax, or grammar, but any help you can give in clarifying meaning will be appreciated. In particular, point out the use of scientific jargon, use of outmoded terminology or incorrect nomenclature.

Your criticisms, arguments, and suggestions concerning the paper will be most useful to the editor and to the author if they are carefully documented. Do not make dogmatic, dismissive statements, particularly about the novelty of the work. Substantiate your statements. Reviewer's recommendations are gratefully received by the editor; however, since editorial decisions are usually based on evaluations derived from several sources, reviewers should not expect the editor to honor every recommendation. You will be asked to suggest acceptability as noted on the specific review form (e.g., accept; accept with revision; reject; modify, re-review required).

RJTI Policies; Ethics

Although the the journal editors of RJTI may be able to note a breach of publication policy or ethical conduct after publication, we rely heavily on the reviewers to detect such problems before publication. RJTI publication policies are described in the Instructions to Authors, which are available online. Some of the items for which you should be alert include:

- Plagiarism – Plagiarism is not limited to the Results and Discussion sections; it can involve any part of the manuscript, including figures and tables, in which material is copied from another publication without attestation, reference, or permission. Note that wording does not have to be exact to be copyright infringement; use of very similar words in almost the same sequence can also be infringement.

- Missing or incomplete attestation – Authors must give appropriate credit to ideas, concepts, and data that have been published previously. This is accomplished by the inclusion of references. Missing, incomplete, or incorrect references must be brought to the editor's attention.
- Dual submission and/or publication – Be wary of attempts to submit/publish similar material more than once. This is often difficult to detect "before the fact," but checking literature citations, as well as having a critical eye, is helpful.
- Conflicts of interest – If you are aware of any commercial affiliations, consultancies, stock or equity interests, or patent-licensing arrangements on the part of the authors, bring them to the attention of the editor.

Note that similar conflicts of interest on your part must also be brought to the attention of the editor in chief, who may, at his discretion, subsequently cancel your invitation to review the manuscript.

In summary, you must communicate suspicions of policy or ethics problems directly to the editor in chief. Under no circumstance should you contact the author directly.