

## REVIEW PROCESS

All the manuscripts submitted for publication to the **Revue Roumaine de Géographie | Romanian Journal of Geography's** Editorial Board undergo an double-blind peer review procedure, necessary for assessing the quality of scientific information, the relevance to the field, the appropriateness of scientific writing style, the compliance with the style and technical requirements of our journal, etc.

The reviewers are selected from the national and international members of the editorial and scientific board who assess the draft of the articles, commenting and making recommendations. The reviewers should be objective and should not have any conflict of interest with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders. All the articles should be treated confidentially. One the important responsibility for the reviewers is to alert the editor to any published or submitted content that is substantially similar to that under review.

Manuscripts submitted to the **Revue Roumaine de Géographie | Romanian Journal of Geography** are subject to the following review procedure:

- the initial review by the Editorial Board;
- the double blind review process for the selected articles. The reviewers send their suggestions to the authors and their recommendations to the editors. If at least one of the reviewers considers that the article does not fulfil the scientific terms of publication, the Editorial Board can refuse its publication.
- the acceptance or the reject on the basis of the objective judgment of reviewers;

## Evaluation form

In order to take the most correct decision regarding the manuscripts submitted to the **Revue Roumaine de Géographie | Romanian Journal of Geography**, the Editing Board is asking the reviewers to respond and comment to the following questions concerning: *the content of the paper* (its significance for the journal's profile, the clarity of the research objectives formulated by the author(s), the novelty and the importance of the results necessary to be published, the aspects concerning the methodology, the relevance of the references), *the writing style* (concordance between title and the content of the manuscript, the ability of the abstract to summarize the main aspects of the paper, the structure of the paper, the clarity and the fairness of the terminology, the relevance of the conclusions), some *additional comments*, *the confidential remarks* to the editors (it is the case) and *the final recommendations* (the reviewers should indicate their own opinion to whether the paper is acceptable for publication, by selecting one of the possibilities "accepted in the present form", "accepted with minor revisions", "accepted with major revisions" or "not accepted").