

ELECTION EXPERT REVIEW

Review Process

The articles submitted for publishing in the Electoral Expert Review undergo a process of scientific review in the "double blind peer-review" system. Thus, each article is reviewed independently by two reviewers independent.

The review process involves the following steps:

1) Sending articles in Romanian or/and in English with the following mandatory elements: title, abstract, keywords, name and affiliation of the author (s), short description of the author (s) experience, expertise and scientific activity (short bio) and a photo by e-mail expert.electoral@roaep.ro;

2) Receiving manuscript to the editor by e-mail mentioned above.

3) The article undergoes a process of preliminary reviewing in terms complying with the following aspects: respecting the topic publication, the guideline conditions for text publication as stated in the "Guideline for authors" If the manuscript does not meet the conditions mentioned above, it shall be returned to the author (s) by the Editorial Board with comments and recommendations on how to improve it.

4) The article is sent to two reviewers. The manuscript is reviewed without the reviewers knowing the identity of the author (s) and vice versa. The scientific review is conducted by specialists with wide recognition in the referred article / paper reviewed.

Designated scientific reviewers may belong to the Scientific Board, the Editorial Board or they might be independent reviewers with acknowledged expertise in the field.

Reviewers are not allowed to circulate externally any manuscripts submitted or part of them. Reviewers should disclose to the Editorial Team any potential conflicts of interest that may arise during the appraisal of the work, as soon as they became aware of this situation.

The reviewing process for the articles is based primarily on the analysis of the following criteria:

- relevance of the article in terms of the aspects approached and the information provided;
- level of creativity and originality, especially in sections of interpretations and conclusions;
- usefulness and appropriateness of results in the current context;
- respecting ethical elements;
- compliance with Article structure (abstract, keywords, introduction, body work, conclusions);
- accuracy of the content, form and substance;
- clear and accessible style.

5) The author (authors) receive from the Editorial Board the article with recommendations on improving it and they are required to send a feedback in a timeframe established between the author (s) and the Editorial Board.

If after the reviewing process the reviewers establish that the article is suspected of plagiarism, they may recommend to the Editorial Board that the article will not be published.

7) Operating the final changes on the form and content of the author (authors). Is achieved only when the author (s) send the article with feedback on the recommendations of the reviewers and the reviewers state that the manuscript has changed the form and content in accordance with the agreed reccomendations.

8) The article is sent for publishing after a final check on the formatting and text requirements made by editorial staff.