

REVIEW PROCESS FOR AUBD

The review process begins with the author submitting their paper to the journal, which is done by e-mail (aubd@drept.unibuc.ro). Authors are advised to briefly underline, in the submitting e-mail, the elements of novelty embodied in the manuscript. On the other hand, should multiple authors submit an article for review, it is presumed that the work is approved by all authors as a whole.

In addition, the authors must provide the editorial office with information regarding their affiliation for all scholarly articles for the last two years of publication and, if any, specific funding or financial support for the research. This includes the university or other institution they have been associated with, as well as a means of contact, preferably e-mail, even though a phone number is also accepted.

After the paper is received, a first step is to identify whether the material complies with structural and format rules, which can be found on our website in Romanian, English and French. Shorter essays can be published on our Forum section. Please keep in mind the forum is exclusively on-line and criteria for publishing in the forum are the same as the journal.

After the initial verification is finished, as described above, the paper will be forwarded to the reviewers if all criteria are met. If the submission is lacking any of the above-mentioned criteria, the author will be contacted, by e-mail, in order to fulfil them. Failure to comply to the editorial office's indications in a reasonable timeframe may impact the possibility of publishing the paper at a later date, if, for example, the subject becomes irrelevant (*e.g.* legal framework is replaced by the legislator, declared unconstitutional).

The reviewing process is done by independent reviewers (from a different institution than the authors), from a list hold by the Editorial Board of AUBD or, if there are no experts relevant in that field, from other recognized experts. Thus, to ensure the best quality of the review, we aim to send papers to reviewers with expertise in the field covered by the manuscript. In addition, to ensure objectivity, we employ a double-blind peer review. The double-blind peer review process implies that the identity of the author is hidden when the reviewer sees the material and that the identity of the reviewer is not disclosed to the author.

Each reviewer will give a [report](#) on the paper, in which they will explain the originality and importance of the papers, the quality of the writing, of the argumentation and the logical deductions and, most importantly, originality.

The report should allow the editors to assess its conclusion based on documented opinion. A text that lacks originality should be signalled as such with the indication of the references to papers that already treated that subject and reached the same conclusion by the same means. The report of the reviewers will also underline weak reasoning, lack of references or unsubstantiated conclusions, with specific indications. Manuscripts will not be denied on the sole basis that reviewers do not agree with the conclusion of the author, if all other criteria are met. However, all texts must be written objectively, without prejudice to individual persons or institutions. Works that are inflammatory, highly political or hateful will not be accepted.

The review report must underline the strengths or the weaknesses of the manuscript, so that it will enforce the decision to publish or give the editorial office clear instructions for the further improvement of the paper. The duration of the process may vary, but the goal is that the author will receive a decision from the editor in 60 days from the date when the paper was sent for review.

After the decision to publish the paper, the author will be informed and the manuscript will enter the editing process. During this time, the author may be requested upon to correct any typing errors, but an alteration of the content will not be allowed, unless the material is re-submitted for review.