

## **Our Peer-Reviewing Policy** (to the public and authors)

Since our 2010 issues, we have gone from a simple/open blind peer-review simple to a *double-blind peer-reviewing system* in order to ensure the quality of our published material. Therefore, all submitted articles must be kept anonymous at all times during the reviewing process, as must the identity of the reviewers.

The reviewers are called to represent the interests of both the authors and the editors by making sure that the content and form of the articles match the highest standards in academic research and publication. Reviewing notes and suggestions must always be polite and constructive. The reviewers will be provided with a peer-reviewing protocol and a guiding worksheet with the evaluation and reviewing criteria by the editors.

We regret we are unable to accept submissions that do not observe the anonymity prerequisites outlined above.

## ***UBR* REVIEWING PROTOCOL** (to the reviewers)

- ***UBR*** uses the *double-blind peer-reviewing* system. The authors and their reviewers must be kept anonymous from one another at all times. All reviewers must observe the suggestions below on preserving anonymity. Should you encounter information that discloses the author's identity, please return the article to us and warn us about the anonymity breach so that we may invalidate the review. The entire reviewing process is strictly confidential and we urge you not to discuss it with third parties.
- We expect all comments and annotations to be constructive and respectful, and we encourage you to use a polite tone and civil style.

## *The University of Bucharest Review*

### *Reviewer's Report*

**Reviewer's name and title(s):**

**Reviewer's Affiliation:**

**Title of article reviewed:**

Criterion	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1. Relevance for the journal theme					
2. Relevance for the area of study					
3. Contribution to the field of research					
4. Clarity of theoretical and methodological background					
5. Structure and rigour of argumentation					
6. Quality of analysis & relevance of examples					
7. Referencing – compliance with MLA style					
8. Language – accuracy, register					

**Reviewer's Recommendation** (Please mark X in the box, as appropriate)

Accept without revision

Accept with revisions

Reject

**Reviewer's comments and/or suggestions for revision:**