GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

The Romanian Journal of Rhinology has a double-blind reviewing process, both the reviewers and the authors remaining anonymous.

Each manuscript submitted for publication is first reviewed by the Journal’s stuff for relevancy to the scope of the Journal. If accepted, the manuscript is included in the peer review process.

If you as a reviewer accept the invitation to review, please avoid a potential conflict of interest. Verify the title page and the Acknowledgment section to verify whether there is any conflict of interest for you. If so, please contact and inform the editor.

Check that you have enough time to review, so you can respect the deadline.

When reviewing an article, please have an impartial, positive, but critical attitude toward the manuscript, with the aim of promoting effective, accurate and relevant scientific communication.

Please consider the following aspects:

Ethics

Plagiarism and fraud. If you suspect that an article is a substantial copy of another work (article, book chapter, etc.) or if you suspect the results to be untrue, please let the editor know. Provide substantial proof.

Dual submission or publication

Missing or incomplete attestation. Missing, incomplete or incorrect references must be brought to the editor’s attention.
Confidentiality

Any manuscript received for review must be considered a confidential document. It must not be discussed with, showed to others, except with the authorization from the editor. Un unpublished material should not be used in reviewer’s own research and the information and ideas should not be used for personal advantage.

The peer review process is confidential; therefore information about the review cannot be shared with 3rd parties, unless you have permission from the editors and authors of the article.

Being a double-blind review process, the identity of the reviewers is not shared with the authors, so please do not reveal your name within the text of your review.

Originality

Does the article suits to the Journal’s standards? Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication? Is the research question an important one?

Structure

Layout and format. Does the author respect the Journal’s Instruction for authors?

Title. Does it clearly describe the article?

Abstract. Does it reflect the content of the article?

Introduction. Does it clearly state the issue being investigated? Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve? Normally, this section of the manuscript should summarize relevant research to provide context, explain other authors’ findings.

Material and method. The authors should explain how the data was collected, the study design. Was the sampling appropriate? Has the author been precise in describing the measurements, the equipment or the investigations performed?

Results. The authors should explain what they discovered during the research, clearly and in a logical sequence. Are the statistics correct?
Discussions. Have the authors indicated how their results relate to the expectation and the earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories?

Conclusions. Do the conclusions explain how the research have enriched the scientific knowledge?

Language. You should not correct the English spelling or grammatical errors. You bring them to editor’s attention.

Communicating your report to the editor

Once you have finished reviewing the manuscript, the next step is to write a report. Provide a quick summary of the article in your report. The commentary should be courteous and constructive, with no personal remarks or personal details. You should explain and support your judgment so that both the editor and authors understand the reason behind your comments.

Classify your recommendation:
- Reject – explain the reason in report
- Accept without revision
- Revision – explain the kind of revision that is required (major / minor)

In need of help

Any queries relating to the content of the paper, please contact the journal editor or the editorial office.

Acceptance/Rejection

The final decision of whether to accept or reject a particular manuscript lies with the editor. The editor will weigh all views and may call for a third opinion or ask the author for a revised paper before making a decision.