

THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

The peer review process of the scholarly journal *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Orală (Annual of the Oral History Institute-AOHI)* follows international standards of evaluation. All submitted manuscripts will be subjected to a blind peer review process involving at least two peer reviewers.

The peer review process includes the following steps:

1. The authors submit the paper to the journal by e-mail.¹ They have to comply with the AOHI editing rules, including the anonymity of the author. When using oral history interviews they have to take into consideration that they are intellectual products of both the interviewee and the interviewer. In this sense, documents attesting copyright (with the explicit declaration of the interviewee who gives the right to the interviewer to use the interviews) are necessary in order to publish excerpts of these interviews in the yearbook. In accordance with the documents, the author uses real names of the interviewees, pseudonyms or opts for anonymity. The authors are requested to attach these documents for each interview they use in their articles which are being submitted to the Call of papers annually made by AOHI.
2. The editor-in-chief of the journal assigns an editor responsible for each issue who checks the paper's composition and format by contrasting it with the AOHI author guidelines in order to make sure it includes all the sections and the stylization. The handling editor makes a general observation if the paper is interesting and original, and if the theme and approach are appropriate for the journal in general or it fits a special thematic issue. At this point, the paper can be rejected without further reviewing or it can be sent to reviewers. Information on this must be sent to the author by the handling editor within one to three weeks from receiving the paper.
3. The editor sends invitations to scholars with relevant expertise on the topic of the paper, asking for an answer, within two weeks, for accepting or rejecting the invitation to review. Potential reviewers are asked to consider the invitation against their own expertise, conflict of interest and availability. As responses are received, further invitations can be issued, if necessary, until 2 reviewers give positive answers. If declining the invitation, the scholars can suggest other reviewers.
4. The paper is read by the reviewers several times. If major problems are found at this stage, the reviewer can reject the paper without any further work. Otherwise, the paper will be assessed point-by-point and comments will be made. The review is sent to the editor in charge with the issue with a recommendation to accept - with or without minor/major changes - or reject it. This stage is about one month.

¹ We have started the process of getting access to the Scholar-One Manuscripts, in order to use this platform for the peer-review.

5. The editor of the journal evaluates all reviews before making the overall decision. In the case with wide difference between the two reviewers, the editor may consider sending the manuscript to a third one.
6. The editor sends an e-mail with the decision regarding the manuscript, including the anonymous comments of the reviewers.
7. If accepted, the paper is sent to publication to the next AIO or assigned to a planned thematic issue. If the paper is rejected or sent back for revision, the editor will include constructive comments from the reviewers to help the author improve the article. If major changes are expected, a revised version of the paper should be sent, within a month, to the reviewers who are expected to give another opinion, unless they have opted out of further participation. If only minor changes were requested, this follow-up review can be done by the editor in charge. Upon receiving the evaluation of the reviewer on the revised version, the editor decides on accepting or rejecting the paper and informs consequently the author. The entire peer-reviewing process may last three to four months.
8. Authors are asked to take into consideration the principles of scientific research ethics when submitting any article. All submitted articles must be original research work, abide by copyright rules, and must not have been published elsewhere or be currently under review for other publications.

**Annual of the Oral History Institute – no/
PEER-REVIEW FORM**

I. Name of the reviewer and institutional affiliation:

II. Title of the article:

III. Please evaluate the content of the article using the following criteria²:

a) Content (please select one option):

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
Problem statement					
Literature review					
Research goals and statements					
Original contribution to the field					
Relevance of the research methodology					
Adequacy of the theoretical approach					
Organization of the article					
Impact of the conclusions					

b) Style & Grammar (please select one option):

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
Writing style					
Clarity of the ideas presented					
Grammatical accuracy					

c) Reviewer’s comments to editor (if any):

d) Reviewer’s comments to author (if any):

e) Final decision (only one option may be selected):

1. Accept without any changes (acceptance): the journal will publish the paper in its original form;
2. Accept with minor revisions (acceptance): the journal will publish the paper and asks the author to make small corrections;
3. Accept after major revisions (conditional acceptance): the journal will publish the paper

² **Important:** For an article to be eligible for publication it must be evaluated at least “**Good**” in all criteria.

provided the authors make the changes suggested by the reviewers and/or editors;

4. Revise and resubmit (conditional rejection): the journal is willing to reconsider the paper in another round of decision making after the authors make major changes;

5. Reject the paper (rejection): the journal will not publish the paper or reconsider it even if the authors make major revisions.

Date and place

Signature