

EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR VOLUMES PUBLISHED BY SCIENTIA PUBLISHING HOUSE

The reviewer is requested to provide an opinion regarding the scientific value of the manuscript and to formulate a clear recommendation concerning its publication.

The evaluation shall be carried out by completing the attached Evaluation Form that can be downloaded from the Publishing House's website: <https://scientiakiado.ro/en/documents>

Please evaluate the manuscript in accordance with the criteria established in the form, and ensure that your comments and recommendations refer exclusively to the evaluated work/study/article.

When preparing the evaluation, please take the following aspects into consideration:

1. A fundamental criterion is whether the manuscript fulfills its stated or implied objectives within the development of the topic and whether it complies with the professional standards of the respective scientific field. The author's/editor's previous professional merits (including those acquired through public activity), popularity, personal moral qualities, etc., are irrelevant in this regard.
2. The reviewer's opinion must be explicit: the manuscript may be published in its submitted form, publication is recommended subject to revisions, or publication is not recommended. In all cases, the opinion must be duly justified. In cases requiring revisions or rejection, the problematic sections must be identified together with suggestions for correction and clarification. In the case of rejection, a well-founded professional argumentation is required, with precise references to the problematic sections, supported by quotations from the manuscript and page references.
3. The most valuable part of the evaluation consists of constructive, concrete, professionally grounded suggestions that contribute to improving the quality of the manuscript. These may concern the structure of the work, recommendations for recent scholarly literature, possible methodological shortcomings, further interpretation of results, directions for future development of the study, etc.
4. The reviewer is also requested to express an opinion regarding the quality of the manuscript's academic language. Orthographic proofreading, insofar as it does not concern specialized terminology, is carried out by the Publishing House; therefore, correction of the manuscript from this perspective is not necessary.
5. Please avoid negative or disparaging formulations concerning the manuscript. If you consider that the work cannot be published due to its insufficient standard or quality, please communicate this to the Publishing House by e-mail.

Please prepare the evaluation in the language in which the manuscript was submitted. A maximum period of one month is available for preparing the evaluation.

The identity of the reviewer is disclosed to the author/editor: the opinion will be forwarded to the author by the Publishing House together with the reviewer's e-mail address. Communication between the author and the reviewer shall take place via e-mail.

The author is obliged to take the reviewer's professional evaluation into consideration and to finalize the manuscript in accordance with the proposed revisions. The implemented modifications shall be verified by the reviewer.

If the author and the reviewer fail to reach an agreement regarding the proposed revisions/corrections, the Publishing House may decide not to publish the manuscript.

The specialist reviewer shall receive remuneration for the evaluation activity.

The publication will indicate the reviewer's name and the locality where they reside and/or carry out their professional activity.

The Publishing House concludes a contract with the reviewer.

Information required for the contract between the Publishing House and the reviewer:

- full name of the reviewer
- personal identification number
- permanent address (including postal code)
- series and number of the identity card/passport, place and date of issue
- e-mail address associated with the PayPal account

Please submit the above information to the Publishing House together with the Evaluation Form.

Appendix

PEER REVIEW FORM

I. Data

Author's/Editor's name	
Manuscript's title	
Peer reviewer's name and her/his institutional affiliation	

II. General evaluation

(For each criterion, please check the box that best matches your judgment: 1=poor 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent)

	1	2	3	4	5
The relevance of the topic for this field of science					
The novelty and originality of the presentation					
Adequacy of the title					
The logical structure of the manuscript					
Consistency between the purpose, content and conclusions					
Quality and appropriateness of the used terminology					
Clarity and editing quality of the figures, graphics and tables					
Language and style used					
Embedment of and building upon the relevant literature					
Accuracy of the bibliographical references					
Quality of the abstracts					

III. Recommendation

(Please mark your judgement)

1.	Accept. The manuscript is acceptable for publication.	
2.	Accept. Minor corrections need to be made.	
3.	Revise. I recommend major corrections before publication.	
4.	Reject. The manuscript is not worth publishing.	

IV. Detailed evaluation

(In the first case, please summarize your opinion in at least 500 characters. In the 2nd, 3rd and 4th cases, please detail your objections and recommendations, referring precisely to the text (part, chapter, page etc.) Feel free to provide additional comments.

Date:

Peer Reviewer

.....