

Instructions for Reviewers

Conflict of Interest

Reviewers should not accept to review a manuscript if there is a conflict of interest. Typical conflicts of interest are:

1. The reviewer has an ownership interest in a company that stands to benefit from the results reported in the manuscript.
2. The reviewer is currently or has recently collaborated with the authors (in the past 5 years)
3. The reviewer feels he/she cannot perform an impartial and objective review due to professional or personal bias.

If the reviewer considers that could be in a potential conflict of interest he/she should immediately announce the editorial team in order to clarify the situation. Also, if the reviewer realizes a conflict of interest after being assigned for a review, please immediately contact the editorial team.

Time

In order to facilitate timely peer-review process we ask our reviewers to perform the peer-review process within 14 days. In addition, after agreeing to perform a review, if the reviewer cannot perform it in the allocated time, please contact the editorial team.

Peer Review Process

Ethical Responsibilities During the Review Process

1. Confidentiality: The reviewer should maintain confidentiality about the existence and substance of the manuscript. They must not share the manuscript or discuss it in detail with others before publication.
2. Reviewer Conduct: As stated in the Uniform Requirements (<http://www.icmje.org/#peer>), “Reviewers must not publicly discuss authors’ work and must not appropriate authors’ ideas before the manuscript is published.

Reviewers must not retain the manuscript for their personal use and should destroy copies of manuscripts after submitting their reviews.”

3.Reporting Ethical Concerns of the reviewed manuscript: The reviewer has the responsibility of noting any ethical concerns, including suspected duplicate publication, fraud, plagiarism, unethical use of humans in the research being reported in the manuscript.

Constructing a Review

Firstly, a letter of intention that comprises the title and abstract of the manuscript is sent to potential reviewers. Those who answer the call will be given full access to the manuscript, alongside with the reviewer form. We expect at least two independent reviewers to perform the peer-review in order to render a final decision

The reviewer form comprises of six sections:

In the first section details for performing the peer-review are given.

In the second section, the reviewer should answer some questions regarding suitability for intended audience, novelty, figures and tables, references, article length, title and approach of the authors.

In the third section the reviewer is asked to rank a manuscript on a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent).

In the fourth section the reviewer is asked for a recommendation for publication. Please indicate whether there are concerns about the statistical approach also.

In the fifth section, the reviewer is asked to write any confidential comments for the editor, comments that will not be disclosed to the authors.

In the last section the reviewer is asked to write any comments for revision to the authors. We kindly ask the reviewers to number each comment and classify their comments into MAJOR COMMENTS and MINOR COMMENTS. In the next two pages we attach the reviewer form. The review form should be sent back no later than 14 days after assignment at editor@intmed.ro

IMPORTANT NOTE: Romanian Journal of Internal Medicine adopts the following peer-review system: the reviewers will know the identity of the authors but the authors will not know the identity of the reviewer.

REVIEWER FORM
ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF INTERNAL MEDICINE
editor@intmed.ro

FOR THE MANUSCRIPT: (TITLE OF THE MANUSCRIPT)

Dear Colleague:

We request that you review the enclosed article. The review is part of a blinded review process in which the identity of the reviewers is masked. Please make all comments on this form, not on the manuscript. The manuscript should not be shown to anyone without permission from the journal.

The first page solicits your comments to the editorial staff. Comments may be continued onto another sheet if necessary.

The second page solicits your comments to the authors. Please be as specific as possible. The review must be returned via e-mail at the address above (editor@intmed.ro) . Please contact us by e-mail if we can be of assistance.

Thank you, in advance, for your help and contribution.

Yours sincerely,

The Editorial Team of Romanian Journal of Internal Medicine

Please answer the following questions, if applicable.

1. Is the subject matter suitable for the intended audience?
2. Does this article contain new ideas or useful synthesis of existing material?
3. If the article contains tables, figures, or appendices, are they useful? Which, if any, could be deleted?
4. Are the references satisfactory?
5. Is the length of the article appropriate to the subject matter is considers?
6. Is the article clearly written?
7. Is the title suggestive of the article's content?

8. Is the article appropriately organized and are the headings indicative of content?

Please rate the quality of the article on the scale below.

1	2	3	4	5
unacceptable				superior

What is your recommendation?

- ☐ Accept as is.
- ☐ Modify: Needs minor revisions as noted in “Specific comments to the editor,” below.
- ☐ Major modification: Review again and reconsider if author(s) revise(s) as you have recommended.
- ☐ Reject for reasons noted in page 2.
- ☐ Please check this box if you are willing to review subsequent revisions of this article.

Reviewer’s comments to the editorial staff (may be continued to another page):

Reviewer’s comments to the authors: