

Evaluation of Publication Requests Submitted to „Aurel Vlaicu” University Publishing House

The evaluation of publication requests submitted to „Aurel Vlaicu” University Publishing House is carried out in four stages:

- 1) Editorial evaluation
- 2) Scientific evaluation (peer-review)
- 3) Ethical evaluation
- 4) Translation review

1) Editorial Evaluation

In the first stage, the scientific works proposed for publication are evaluated by the Editorial Board, which verifies whether the work is consistent with the profile of the publishing house’s collections and whether it complies with the technical requirements imposed by the publisher.

During the editorial evaluation process, the following criteria will prevail:

- 1) The potential impact of the scientific work
- 2) The target readership
- 3) Promotion and distribution possibilities
- 4) The reputation of the author(s)
- 5) The relevance and timeliness of the topic in specialized literature and in the media
- 6) The impact of the author’s/ authors’ previous volumes



2) Scientific Evaluation (Peer-Review)

If the proposed publication project meets the editorial, administrative, and technical criteria of UAV Publishing House, it proceeds to the next evaluation stage, namely the scientific peer-review process. UAV Publishing House gives preference to blind peer-review processes (a scientific evaluation process in which reviewers know the identity of the author(s), but the author(s) do not know the identity of the reviewers), as well as double blind peer-review (the manuscript is anonymized, and reviewers also remain anonymous). The anonymized manuscripts are sent to two specialist reviewers selected from the UAV Publishing House Reviewers List, at least one of whom must be from outside “Aurel Vlaicu” University.

Each reviewer independently analyzes the work submitted to the peer-review process, taking into account the following scientific quality evaluation criteria:

- 1) Adequate formulation of the title
- 2) Relevance of the abstract, keywords, and thematic framing in relation to the content of the paper
- 3) Clarity of the paper’s structure and its adequacy to the topic addressed
- 4) Scientific quality of the content
- 5) Degree of novelty of the work
- 6) Originality in addressing the issue under discussion
- 7) Clarity and conciseness of the text presentation
- 8) Solid argumentation of the presented study
- 9) Absence of errors, misconceptions, and ambiguities
- 10) Quality of the bibliography
- 11) Quality and number of citations



For each criterion included in the peer-review form, a score from 1 to 5 is awarded. Reviewers must submit their evaluation report to the editor in due time (maximum 45 days), including the scores awarded for each criterion and the final score.

Based on these scores, the Editorial Board decides whether to:

- 1) Accept and recommend publication of the work
- 2) Accept the work subject to minor or major revisions
- 3) Reject the work

Authors may propose specialist reviewers when submitting their work for publication. These may include research team coordinators, doctoral thesis supervisors, or members of advisory committees. The expertise of reviewers proposed by the authors will be considered by the Editorial Board in the final decision regarding acceptance of the scientific work.

3) Ethical Evaluation

Ethical evaluation involves detecting potential plagiarism. Specialist reviewers will consider the originality of the work at a conceptual level, ensuring strict compliance with academic citation requirements accepted in the research field to which the proposed work belongs.

If there are suspicions of fraud, these will be communicated in writing to UAV Publishing House.

4) Translation Review

Translation review concerns the evaluation of the quality of translations into Romanian or from Romanian into another foreign language.

The evaluation is carried out by a specialist—either a speaker proficient in the source language or a native speaker. Failure by the author(s) to revise the translation at the publisher's request will result in the rejection of the proposed work.

