

# Romanian Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Traumatology

---

## EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

**Prof. Cătălin Cîrstoiu, M.D., PhD,**

Dean of "Carol Davila" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, University Emergency Hospital Bucharest, Romania

**Contact:** editor@rojost.ro

## Peer review process

Any submission will not be processed unless it has a signed authorship. This will avoid eventual conflicts between authors. Authors are advised to provide recent references (2014 and recently), and from peer-reviewed journals. Papers with references before 2014 are discouraged.

After uploading to Manuscript Central, each manuscript receives an individual identification code that is used in all correspondence regarding the publication process.

However, a submission may be declined by the Editor without review, if the studies reported are not sufficiently novel or important to deserve to be published in the journal. Manuscripts deemed unsuitable (insufficient originality or of limited interest to the target audience) are returned to the author(s) without review. The Managing Editor may appoint an Editor, with expertise in the relevant field, who is fully responsible for further handling the manuscript and an ultimate decision about its acceptance/ rejection. All articles are verified with iThenticate before being sent to reviewers. The Editor seeks advice from experts in the appropriate field. Research articles and communications are refereed by a minimum of two reviewers, review papers by at least three.

The authors are requested to suggest the names of at least five potential reviewers (persons competent to review their manuscript) from outside their institution, who have not been collaborators or co-authors within the last three years and have not provided advice or critique of the submitted manuscript. Authors may list up to a maximum of three reviewers they wish to exclude. However, it should be noted that this will be treated only as a suggestion, and the final selection of reviewers is exclusively the Editor's decision.

Please note that the authors' names or their institution identifiers are not revealed to the referees, the Editorial Office removing all the afore-mentioned information before sending papers to reviewers.

The reviewers make an objective, impartial evaluation of scientific merits of the manuscript.

Reviewers operate under guidelines set forth in the Guidelines for reviewers and are asked to comment on the following aspects of submitted manuscripts:

- novelty and originality of the work;
- broad interest to the community of researchers;
- significance to the field, potential impact of the work, conceptual or methodological advances described;
- study design and clarity;
- substantial evidence supporting claims and conclusions;
- rigorous methodology

If a manuscript is believed not to meet the standards of the journal or is otherwise lacking in scientific rigor or contains major deficiencies, the reviewers will attempt to provide constructive criticism to assist the authors in ultimately improving their work. If a manuscript is believed to be potentially acceptable for publication but needs to be improved, it is invited for reconsideration with the expectation that the authors will fully address the reviewer's suggestions. Once all reviews have been received and considered by the Editor, a decision letter to the author is drafted.

### ***Several types of decisions are possible:***

- Accept without revision
- Minor revision
- Major revision
- Reject