

## **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.

## ***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.

# UBR Review Form

**Article title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall recommendation:**

---

**Please select one of the following options:**

- Accept as is
- Accept with minor revisions as suggested in this form without further review
- Invite revision and resubmission for further review
- Reject outright

Does this manuscript clearly illustrate the issues, problems and trends related to the theme of this proposed issue?

Title, abstract, keywords (please elaborate if the title reflects the content of the article, the abstract is clear and concise, and the keywords reveal the essence of the major topic)

State of art (please elaborate whether the relevance of the research is indicated, is integrated in the general academic discussion in the field, and the methodology is clearly presented and sources are described)

Research findings (please indicate whether the findings are clearly presented, the limitations of the study are noted when applicable)

Conclusions (please indicate whether the conclusions reflect the stated goals of the article, its methods and the findings)

References and Literature (please state whether the requirements for references, quotations are met, and conflict of interests are avoided)

Language and Style (please indicate whether the academic language and style are adequate or they require revision)

**Comments for the Author(s):**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

*Please evaluate the quality of the manuscript. We would be grateful if you could comment in particular on the its originality; academic rigor; the quality of the research and contribution to the field; and presentation. Please use as much space as you require. Please feel free also to insert additional comments in the attached Word file using the 'Track Changes' function.*

**Confidential comments for the Editors (if required):**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Contact the Editors:**

ubrpublication@gmail.com