

## Paper Review Policy

### *for the International Journal of Mechatronics and Applied Mechanics*

Document Reference and Version No:	PO/PRP/01 Version 1.0
Purpose:	The purpose of this Policy is to describe the most customary criteria used in reviewing papers, the description of the review process in such a fashion as to be understandable and to ensure the coherence of the practice of the Editorial Board, which is genuinely difficult to unify due to the physical distance and international, as well as multidisciplinary background of the reviewers, but also to offer applicant authors more details on the review process and the requirements they must comply with. In the end, the role of this document is to ensure transparency of the practice and to allow authors to line up with the requirements of the Editorial Board. Still, this file is not mandatory for the members of the Editorial Board, but it is designed just as an aid for their work.
Commencement Date:	February 2017
Date of Next Review:	As requested by the interested parties
Revision History:	New Document
Policy Author(s):	Andreea Stanciu, Editor Octavia Căruntu, Editor Professor, PhD Eng. Gheorghe, Editor-in-Chief

## **Table of Contents**

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Review Process Methodology .....	4
3. Criteria for Reviewing the Journal. Reviewer Reports – For Reviewers Only ..	6
4. Miscellaneous .....	8
Appendix 1 Paper Assessment Form – For Reviewers Only .....	9

## 1. Introduction

At the moment of writing this policy, the journal is divided in two main areas, with a main responsible (Co-Editor-in-chief) responsible for each one:

1. Mechatronics Design
2. Applied Mechanics

Each main topic is structured in 4 sub-areas (8 fields of research for the journal), each with an Associate Editor assigned:

1. Under Mechatronics topic:
  - 1.1. Robotics and Automation
  - 1.2. Measurement Systems and Image Processing
  - 1.3. Mechatronic Systems and Manufacturing Processes
  - 1.4. Electronics and Cyber-Physical Systems
2. Under Applied Mechanics topic:
  - 2.1. Materials Science,
  - 2.2. Structural Mechanics,
  - 2.3. Fluid Mechanics,
  - 2.4. Technology of Measurement and Instrumentation.

The practice of review is to ensure that good scientific work is published. It is a process that plays a vital role in maintaining the high standards of *International Journal of Mechatronics and Applied Mechanics* and papers are reviewed following the procedure outlined in this policy.

Special Issues have different peer review procedures involving guest editors. They are particular cases and need an adequate treatment. Authors publishing in special issues to the journal may receive full details of the review process on request from the Editorial Board at the given time.

## 2. Review Process Methodology

These guidelines specify the procedures and methodology for the functioning of the review and evaluation process for the *International Journal of Mechatronics and Applied Mechanics*.

Manuscripts with contents outside the main topics of the journal will not be considered for review.

The review process is confidential and identities of the persons who review papers will not be revealed to the authors. Also, the submitted manuscripts are treated as confidential documents.

### **Initial Manuscript Evaluation**

All papers need to be submitted by e-mail (incdmtm@incdmtm, with Cc to [andreea.popescu@incdmtm.ro](mailto:andreea.popescu@incdmtm.ro)). They are checked by the Editor in Chief for completeness and adherence to best practices in academic writing. Those that pass this first round of evaluation are then assigned to one of the two Co-Editors-in-chief of the two main areas for consideration and are sent for review to the Associate Editors. Authors of manuscripts that are rejected in the initial evaluation stage will normally be informed in a short period of time.

### **Associate Editor Evaluation**

When assigned a new submission, the Senior Editors will decide if the paper should go to peer review or if it should be rejected without review. Manuscripts rejected at this stage do not correspond to the journal's topics, lack originality or have poor grammar or English language.

Those manuscripts considered suitable for review are passed to the Associate Editors.

### **The entire review process involves the following steps:**

1. Receiving the paper by e-mail (incdmtm@incdmtm, with Cc to andreea.popescu@incdmtm.ro).
2. Assigning the paper to the Co-editor-in-chief of an area to evaluate whether the paper will go for the next step of evaluation or not.
3. The Co-editor-in-chief on an area will send it for revision to a Co-editor of his or her choice.

4. Co-editor will assign the paper for, at least, three reviewers, on the domain.
5. Each reviewer will fill the evaluation form and will send it back to the co-editor.
6. Final evaluation of the paper will be performed by Co-Editor and Co-editor-in-chief.
7. Communicating the acceptance or rejection of the paper to the corresponding author
8. If accepted, receiving the final version of the paper. A deadline will be established and indicated to the corresponding author.
9. If a paper is accepted, the editors will manage the queue in order to guarantee the publication of the paper as soon as possible. Publishing the paper.

**This process requires a few mentions:**

The e-mail address used for submitting papers to the journal is [incdmtm@incdmtm](mailto:incdmtm@incdmtm). It is operated by the Editorial Board. Should a member of the Editorial Board need to notify the Editorial Board on any **aspect, they should use the aforementioned address.**

**All correspondence with the authors falls in the responsibilities of the Editorial Board. They notify authors on acceptance/rejections, changes needed and any further aspects.**

**All correspondence between the reviewers on the matter of a paper needs to include a CC field. This field will be filled with the following e-mail: [andreea.popescu@incdmtm.ro](mailto:andreea.popescu@incdmtm.ro)**

### 3. Criteria for Reviewing the Journal. Reviewer Reports – For Reviewers Only

#### ➤ Reviewer reports

Reviewers are asked to evaluate a manuscript for:

- Originality and complexity;
- Significance, applicability, scientific impact;
- Coverage of appropriate existing literature;
- Adequacy of methodology, analysis and interpretation;
- Clear, concise writing style;
- Presentation and organization of the paper.

#### ➤ Checklist of review criteria

##### • Title and abstract

- The title is clear and informative.
- The title is representative of the content (not misleading).
- The abstract is thorough, essential details are presented.
- There are no inconsistencies between the abstract and the text.
- All of the information given in the abstract is present in the text.

##### • Originality and complexity

- The content of the paper is new or original.
- The paper should address an important research problem or question, display a high level of creativity or innovation in research.

##### • Significance, applicability, scientific impact;

- The paper should have scientific impact

- The paper must be useful to practitioners or researchers or both.
- The paper must contain specific, proven, significant research.
- **Coverage of appropriate existing literature**
  - The literature review is up-to-date.
  - The number of references and their selection is appropriate.
  - The review of the literature is well integrated.
  - The references are mainly primary sources.
- **Adequacy of methodology, analysis and interpretation;**
  - The development and content is sufficiently described.
  - The data set is sufficiently described or referenced.
  - The subject should be complete, well organized, and supported by understandable and useful tables, figures, and references.
  - Data presented must be valid, and the research methods described should be appropriate.
  - Conclusions should be valid, appropriate, and properly supported.
- **Clear, concise writing style**
  - The text is well written and easy to follow.
  - The English vocabulary is appropriate.
- **Presentation and organization of the paper**
  - The paper follows the style guidelines suggested by the Editorial Board.
  - The manuscript is well organized.
  - The tables and figures are used effectively and linked with the text.
  - Reference citations are complete.

#### 4. Miscellaneous

**The decision to accept or to reject a paper belongs entirely to the review team.** The Editorial Board has no say in this matter for objectivity reasons. Only papers agreed on by the reviewer and the Co-editor-in-chief will be published.

**All aspects related to copyright matters fall in the responsibility of authors.** They will sign a copyright agreement and a non-plagiarism agreement in which they will decline the property of the paper to the journal and will declare on oath that the work described in the paper and the paper is genuine.

**The paper publishing policy established a number of 40 papers per issue.** All papers that will be rejected can be re-submitted for evaluation for next issue but also good papers can be left in a cue should this number of papers be exceeded. This is why, in order to keep track of papers and reviewer decisions, reviewers are advised to send us a Carbon Copy (CC) of e-mails.

Publishing in the journal is free of charge at this time. The only condition to publish one or more papers in *International Journal of Mechatronics and Applied Mechanics* is to go through the review process and be accepted. Apart from scientific constraints, formal ones also need to be respected, so keeping the editing of the work according to the template is mandatory.

All authors must keep in mind that the journal offers free access and it is intended to be indexed in main databases available. This is why this premise must be agreed upon before sending any paper for review.

**Papers need to have high quality graphics.** Reproducing graphics with no permission of other authors is the responsibility of the author who submits a paper and will remain his or her after receiving our agreement to publish the paper. **The advice resolution for photos is at least 300 DPI and below 200 DPI is not acceptable and leads to the rejection of a paper.**

**Selected references need to be as close as possible to the subject of the paper.**

**In line with editorial requirements, a paper should have at least 6 pages** (references included). We advise authors not to exceed 10 pages..



## Appendix 1 Paper Assessment Form – For Reviewers Only

### PAPER ASSESSEMENT FORM<sup>1</sup>

- Paper title:
  
- Paper authors:
  
- Keywords:

### PAPER EVALUATION REPORT

#### Evaluation result:

Score:

#### Criteria

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent
<b>Scores</b>					
Title and abstract (does it reflect/represent the content of the paper?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall quality of content, research approach	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Significance, applicability, scientific impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Originality/innovation and complexity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presentation and quality of writing (English)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coverage of literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Please note the scores must be between 1 and 5.**

#### Interpretation:

- 0 – The paper fails to address the criterion.  
 1 – Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are a large number of weaknesses.

<sup>1</sup> This is document not mandatory for the members of the editorial team. This is just a facultative tool that can serve as an example.

- 2 – Fair.                    The paper addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
- 3 – Good.                 The paper addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are still present.
- 4 – Very good.         The paper addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5 – Excellent.          The paper successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion.

**Justification of the scores**

**Criterion 1: Title and abstract**

**Criterion 2: Overall quality of content, research approach**

**Criterion 3: Significance, applicability, scientific impact**

**Criterion 4: Originality/innovation and complexity**

**Criterion 5: Presentation and quality of writing**

**Criterion 6: Coverage of literature**

**Recommendation to Editors**

	<b>Strongly reject</b>	<b>Reject</b>	<b>Marginally accept</b>	<b>Accept</b>	<b>Strongly accept</b>
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>