

## **PEER-REVIEW PROCESS REVIEW OF GENERAL MANAGEMENT (RGM)**

**Review of General Management (RGM)** is one of the first publications promoting within its pages relevant and current results of the activity of managerial research, making possible the free expression of opinions, ideas and theories based on the thorough study of the managerial phenomena and processes from a global point of view.

The review has been published in a **new series since 2005**, two issues per year.

The requirements on the quality of the materials that are published are similar to prestigious reviews and journals in the country and abroad, the articles being evaluated by many criteria by the experts of the Scientific Council, through **the peer-review system**.

### **The following stages are used in the peer-review process:**

#### **1. Preliminary Stage**

All submitted articles must pass through the *peer-review process* in order to be published in the Review of General Management (RGM).

The articles will be sent to the Editorial Board using on-line correspondence (by e-mail) at ***redactie\_rmg@yahoo.com***. Within 10 days from the on-line correspondence submission date the author will receive a confirmation e-mail.

Also, the article will receive a unique identification number, which will be used during the review process and also during the publishing process, ensuring an objective assessment of the paper.

The articles written by authors who haven't earned the scientific degree "Ph.D" (or any other equivalent) will be assessed to the peer-review process only if the article is accompanied by a written recommendation from an expert in the field of activity the article refers to.

#### **2. The peer-review objective**

The peer-review objective is to reach an adequate scientific level for all the published articles and also to bring-up new significant contributions in the approached fields of activity.

#### **3. Defining peer-review procedures**

The peer-review procedures applied by the **Review of General Management (RGM)** are:

- ◆ **"Editorial Board Peer-Review"** (the assessment is performed by members of the Editorial Board). All Editorial Board members are also members of the academic community.
- ◆ **"Expert Peer-Review"** (the scientific assessment is performed by members of the Scientific Council). All Scientific Council members have earned the scientific degree "Ph. D." and are experts in their fields of activity.

#### **4. Editorial Board Peer-Review - detailed presentation**

The articles submitted, in order to be published in RGM, are initially reviewed by the Editorial Board members (using the *Editorial Board Peer-Review* procedure). The goal of this procedure is to determine the manner in which the submitted articles integrate with the reviews' standards, characteristics and also field of activity.

Editorial Board of the **Review of General Management (RGM)** consists of:

**Director:** Prof. Ph.D. DHC Ion Petrescu

**Editor-in-chief:** Prof. Ph.D. Camelia Stefanescu

**Scientific PR coordinator:** Prof. Ph.D. Emilian M. Dobrescu

Editorial Board Peer-Review aims on the following editorial requests:

- the articles have to enclose thematically in the reviews' profile;
- materials have to bring out original items, with current interest;
- materials must have high scientific content;
- articles must be presented without political interests;
- articles must be presented without containing classified data;
- the author(s) can publish a single article in each issue of the review;
- material size has to be of 7-20 pages;
- an abstract of 100 - 150 words;
- key words;
- JEL classification of the current article (available at [http://www.aeaweb.org/journal/jel\\_class\\_system.html](http://www.aeaweb.org/journal/jel_class_system.html));
- quotations from literature has to be in an uniform style, both in text and in bibliography / references. In text: (Becker, G. S., 2001) or (Becker, G. S., 2001, p.110);
- bibliography or references will have the next format: name, initial of first name, year of publishing, paper title, printing house, city of publishing;
- font type: Times New Roman;
- letter size: titles 14 Bold, subtitles 13 Bold, text 12 Normal;
- text editor: Microsoft Word.

The preliminary evaluation (Editorial Board Peer-Review) can be considered complete with the article inclusion in one of the specific topics of Review of General Management (RGM). These fields can be consulted by the authors on the website.

#### **5. Expert Peer-Review - detailed presentation**

“Expert Peer-Review” procedure is realized by two distinct scientific reviewers, who are members of the academic community and who earned the scientific degree of Prof Ph. D., Senior Lecturer Ph. D. or 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> degree scientific researcher. If necessary, the article can be reviewed by a third scientific reviewer, from the members of RGM Scientific Council.

**Scientific board** of Review of General Management (RGM) consists of:

Prof. Ph.D. Ioan Abrudan, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca

Prof. Ph.D. hab. Grigore Belostecinic, Rector of the Academy of Economic Studies, Chişinău, Republic of Moldova

Prof. Ph.D. Aurelian A. Bondrea, „Spiru Haret” University, Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Constantin Brătianu, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Piotr Bula, University of Economic Studies, Cracovia, Poland

Prof. Ph.D. Mircea Ciumara, Director General of the Institute of National Economy, Romanian Academy, Bucharest

Prof. Ph.D. Dmitri Chistilin, University of Economics and Law, Dnipropetrovsk, Ukraine

Senior Researcher Ph.D. Constantin Ciutacu, Institute of National Economy, Romanian Academy, Bucharest

Prof. Ph.D. Vadim Cojocaru, Academy of Economic Studies, Chişinău, Republic of Moldova

Prof. Ph.D. Emilian M. Dobrescu, „Spiru Haret” University, Bucuresti, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Dumitru Constantinescu, University of Craiova, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Valeriu Ioan Franc, Institute of National Economy, Romanian Academy, Bucharest

Prof. Ph.D. Liviu Ilieş, „Babeş Bolyai” University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Gheorghe Ionescu, West University of Timisoara, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. George Kleiner, Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

Prof. Ph.D. Mimi Kornazheva, Director of Bulgarian-Romanian Interuniversity Europe Center, Russe, Bulgaria

Prof. Ph.D. Viorel Lefter, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Aurel Manolescu, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. I.V. Makogon, National University, Ukraine

Senior lecturer Ph.D. Marian Năstase, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Nica Panaite, „Alexandru Iona Cuza” University, Iaşi, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Ion Petrescu, „Spiru Haret” University, Bucuresti, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Ovidiu Nicolescu, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Constantin Oprean, „Lucian Blaga” University, Sibiu, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Stelian Pânzaru, „Spiru Haret” University, Bucuresti, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Ion Plumb, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Napoleaon Pop, Institute of National Economy, Romanian Academy, Bucharest

Prof. Ph.D. Constantin Posea, „Spiru Haret” University, Bucuresti, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. L.M. Skorik, Academy of Business and Economic Studies, Belorussia

Prof. Ph.D. Camelia Ştefănescu, „Spiru Haret” University, Bucuresti, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Alexandru Ştefan, Bloomfield College, New Jersey, SUA

Prof. Ph.D. Valentina Vasile, Institute of National Economy, Romanian Academy, Bucharest

Prof. Ph.D. Ion Verboncu, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Ph.D. Gheorghe Zaman, Corresponding member of the Romanian Academy

Scientific reviewers are chosen using the specialization criteria. The specialization should match with the field of activity in which the article was included after the “Editorial Board Peer-Review” procedure.

The appointed members from the Review of General Management (RGM) receive, in advance, the material in order to be analyzed. The scientific meeting will be based on the use of the peer-review forms. During this scientific meetings one of the two (three) reviewers will be appointed leader and will have the responsibility for the accurateness and clarity of the information and also for the confidential transfer of information towards the Chief Editor of RGM.

The Expert Peer-Review assesses the article through the following scientific criteria:

❖ Scientific content quality

- the correlation between the paper content and the scientific base;
- the manner in which the analysis models are implemented in the material;
- originality of the submitted subject.

❖ The paper's relevance, impact and importance

- the paper's relevance upon academic research activities;
- the paper's impact upon the fields that have connexions with the article.

❖ Technical content quality

- the relevance of bibliographic sources;
- text clarity, text concision and text accuracy;
- the lack of errors, wrong concepts and ambiguities in the presented paper.

The detailed presentation for the scientific criteria can be consulted on RGM peer-review form.

“Expert Peer-Review” scientific assessment process concludes by granting the paper with one of the following **qualificative**: “**accepted**”, “**accepted, with changes**”, or “**rejected**”. This qualificative is given by the scientific reviewers, using the previous presented criteria.

## **6. Peer-Review Form**

Peer-Review form can be defined as the background of the peer-review process. Initially, this form has to be fill in by RGM Chief Editor, and, afterwards, by the appointed reviewers from the Scientific Council. The form will then be delivered back to the Editorial Board both for storage and for acknowledge of the author about the reviewers' decision and possible suggestions.

## **7. Authors' and Reviewers' rights and responsibilities**

### Authors' rights:

- a. The submitted papers' authors have the right to keep in touch with the Editorial Board during the entire peer-review process in order to receive all the information regarding the stage of the process in which the material is.
- b. The papers' authors have the right to request any extra information from the Scientific Council if the material is qualificative as “rejected” by the reviewers.
- c. During the peer-review process, authors' identity is protected against the reviewers that are appointed to asses the article.
- d. The author has the right to request justifications if the deadlines, stipulated at point 8, are outrun.

### Authors' responsibilities:

- a. The authors have the responsibility to ensure that the orthographical correction was made before the submission of the articles.
- b. The authors have the responsibility to provide an adequate bibliography according to the reference materials;
- c. The authors have the responsibility to respect Law number 206/2004 concerning the fair-play in scientific research activities;
- d. The authors should declare on their own responsibility that the material hasn't been published in other reviews.

Note: It is supposed that authors know and respect the Law concerning Copyright.

### Reviewers' rights :

- a. The reviewers have private access to RGM website, using individualized accounts.
- b. The reviewers are authorized to make the necessary recommendations to the submitted article in order to reach the demanded requests.
- c. The reviewers have the autonomy to referee the material with the desired qualitative after realizing the scientific review.

### Reviewers' responsibilities:

- a. The reviewers are authorized to referee only the material that where appointed to them.
- b. The reviewers have the responsibility not to outrun the deadlines stipulated at point 8. As a consequence, the peer-review form must be sent in an electronic form or using any other form.

## **8. Deadlines**

Confirmation for the received materials to the Editorial Board of RGM has to be made within 10 days.

Within 30 days from receiving the confirmation, the Editorial Board will send to the authors an e-mail notifying the decision about publishing the material.

The period of time between the confirmation e-mail and the publishing date of a material usually doesn't overrun 8 months, depending on the review periodicity, the already-existing article portfolio and the subjects approached by each review issue.

## **9. Final observations**

- ◆ The scientific reviewers and the Editorial Board are not responsible for any orthographical and content mistakes.
- ◆ Review of General Management (RGM) will only publish articles with a scientific approach.

## **10. Contact**

**“SPIRU HARET” UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT BRASOV**

no 7, Turnului Street, Brasov, Romania

Phone: +40 268 548 044 Fax: +40 268 548 045

**Email:** redactie\_rmg@yahoo.com

**Web:** www.managementgeneral.ro

