

**ANALELE UNIVERSITĂȚII DIN ORADEA FASCICULA LIMBA ȘI
LITERATURA ROMÂNĂ**

ISSN 1224-7588

"Analele Universității din Oradea. Seria Filologie. Fascicula Limba și Literatura Română" is the same journal with "Analele Universității din Oradea Fascicula Limba și Literatura Română". Initially *Seria Filologie* referred to the two fascicules in the series, now there is only one fascicule in *Seria Filologie*. Alternative title in English: "Annals of The University of Oradea Romanian Language and Literature Fascicule"

Peer-review policy

ALLRO advocates the open peer-review systems. It means that the sender of the manuscript appears with her/his name when the manuscript is sent by the reviews editor to the peer-reviewers.

We have weighed up the pros and cons of masked author identity in the first stage versus open identity of manuscript sender throughout both stages of publishing. We totally agree with the masked review policy as a necessary tool for the warranty of objective, unbiased evaluations. However, guided by the purpose of our journal above all, we have resorted to the open, unmasked review. The authors must assume their ideas and be able to defend them against critical evaluations. It is more challenging for the authors to appear with their names from the beginning. This way the journal aims to retain some of the benefits of the writer-reader relationship. Even a text of criticism and/or a research article, even a book review is a form of creation. The peer-reviewer enters a genuine dialogue with the text. The sent manuscript always becomes enriched by being read, assessed and by having this dialogue with a professional reader. On the other hand, unsure senders of poor manuscripts are urged to be more rigorous, since they are more exposed this way, with their names written on the papers.

Author-reviewer mediation

The editor-in-chief, the associate editor-in-chief and the editorial secretary can *never* perform the job of peer-reviewing for ALLRO, as long as they are in these positions. The section-editors are not allowed to do the peer-reviewing job for ALLRO. The reviews editors have the mission to facilitate the circulation of manuscripts from the authors to the peer-reviewers. The reviews editors are not peer-reviewing for ALLRO. The editor-in-chief, the associate editor-in-chief and the editorial secretary can start their job after they have the results of peer-reviewing for articles, never before the articles are assessed.

The author-peer-reviewer mediation is not a 'blind' one. The parity (author knowing her/his peer-reviewers) is achieved by our publishing of the complete list of reviewers. We, ALLRO executive editors, cannot assume to mediate this parity. Some authors have difficulties in accepting criticism. They should know that it is a personal attitude and this choice cannot call into question the good intentions of the peer-reviewers. In an ideal world, we would be the mediators of a complete parity, for the sake of dialogue, after the publication of the journal.

Print stages and peer-review procedure:

The preparation of the new issue of ALLRO has two stages: the preparation of

the draft issue and the turning of the draft issue into the finite print work.

The coordination role for the first stage belongs to the reviews editors. They elaborate and follow the chart of distributing the manuscripts to the peer-reviewers. Each manuscript has two peer-reviewers assigned. There are situations when a third peer-reviewer with competences in the language of the manuscript is required.

The peer-reviewers send to the reviews editors the filled-in form with their evaluation concerning the publication, their comments and suggestions for correction, their indications about the parts that need revision. The reviews editors pass on the indications for revisions, the corrections and suggestions to the manuscript sender. The reviews editors keep all the forms filled-in by the peer-reviewers in a special file, in print form. While the authors are expected to improve their manuscripts with the suggested corrections, the reviews editors, together with the section editors, prepare a draft of the new issue of the journal with the manuscripts accepted for publication by the peer-reviewers. The reviews editors manage all the necessary steps of the first stage. They are helped by the section-editors with the draft issue. When the authors return their manuscripts with the included corrections, the reviews editors check the overall congruency of the revisions with the indications or comments of the forms filled-in by the peer-reviewers. They decide if the manuscript should be sent again to the peer-reviewers for a second evaluation. In cases of major revisions, the improved manuscript is definitely sent for a second time to the peer-reviewers.

For the second stage, that of turning the draft into a printed journal, the managing role is that of the editor-in-chief, who, assisted by the associate editor-in-chief, will ensure the correct distribution of roles among the editorial team and will ensure the clarity of the contents. The editor-in-chief manages all practical and literary aspects of ALLRO. The collaboration with the advisory board, the print supervision, and the distribution of the journal are achieved by the editor-in-chief.

The unification of the first stage with the second stage is the key-task of the editorial secretary. His tasks are both of a practical and critical evaluative nature. He has the freedom to decide on any necessary extra-steps or extra-measures in order to ensure the best synchronization between the two stages. The editorial secretary is also the main layout editor.

When the draft of the new issue is handed in to the editorial secretary, who is in charge of turning it into the finite work of print, he makes a careful scheduling of re-collecting the improved manuscripts. The editorial secretary makes up the table of contents and, after meetings with the editor-in-chief, decides on the sections of the new issue.

The final decision of the selection or rejection of a manuscript is taken by the editor-in-chief, together with the editorial secretary and the associate editor-in-chief. They carefully analyze the file with the responses of the peer-reviewers. The two peer-reviewers of each manuscript have already expressed their opinions: "pro" or "against" publication (Yes/No on the final question of the peer-review form. See our peer-review form here: http://analeromana.uoradea.ro/model_bun_pr.pdf) The peer-review form can be available in just one language, at request, for simplification. The peer-reviewer is allowed to use his/her free style. The peer-reviewers are free to use this form and they are free, as well, to simply write notes, observations on submitted

manuscripts regardless of our peer-review form. Feedback in the form of written notes, free structure, is fully accepted. The peer-reviewer must give their Yes/No for publication, with minor or major changes, but with a definite verdict on "publishable or not publishable"). The three mentioned executive editors also express an opinion after re-evaluating the manuscript, either "pro" or "against" publication. The management never starts this procedure before peer-reviewing, only after. The majority (≥ 3 of the 5 opinions) wins. The author is informed by one of the reviews editors. If the topic of the manuscript is not covered by ALLRO, the reviews editors inform the author directly without sending the manuscript to the peer-reviewers.

The section editors help the reviews editors for the completion of the first stage. For the second stage, they are assigned new tasks by the editor-in-chief and by the editorial secretary.

As stated in our ethical code
<http://analeromana.uoradea.ro/ethical%20code%20for%20publishing.pdf>

let us suppose the principles of the peer-reviewer and the general principles of our journal are not the same. Whose should be the guiding principle? The peer-reviewer must respect the fact that our peer-review process is single-blind. Other than that, the peer-reviewer must have the freedom to respect his/her own principles while assessing the manuscript, rather than respecting the journal's principles. For example the journal might have the principle of encouraging growth and potential, the peer-reviewer might have other principles. The journal should guarantee the peer-reviewer the necessary trust without imposing the journal's principles.

About peer-reviewers

Our journal has a clear policy of selecting the peer-reviewers on the basis of their proven affinities and activities. We are familiar with the books and articles published by our peer-reviewers and with their domains of interest. We have contacted in person all the peer-reviewers of our journal. We have not resorted yet to the practice of peer-reviewers selected on a basis of an application form (but a future expansion of our journal may bring the adoption of this practice).

Who are our peer-reviewers? First of all, intellectuals with an authentic passion for reading and for culture, proven by their activities and achievements. They are our colleagues (peers) from other Romanian universities and from abroad institutes and universities. Or they work in institutions of culture and education or in the cultural press. If the one of the peer-reviewers has excellent competences in Romanian literature and can give valuable comments on the contents of the manuscript but s/he declines to assess the article from the point of view of linguistic corrections, spelling, focusing mainly on the literary evaluation, then a third peer-reviewer is assigned to that manuscript with a specific task of language corrections. The peer-reviewers may use English, Romanian or the language of the manuscript. They must be fluent in the language of the manuscript they evaluate.

In case of simultaneous unavailability of some of the peer-reviewers, the reviews editors address the editor-in-chief to supplement the list of peer-reviewers.

We rely on the discernment of our peer-reviewers and we are thankful for their confirmed good intentions.

The peer-reviewers are the people who provide vital help with the quality assurance of our journal. We can say that they provide "the quality control" necessary for ALLRO's publication and progress.

© ALLRO PEER-REVIEW POLICY