

Paper Review Procedure

for the International Journal of Mechatronics and Applied Mechanics

Document Reference and Version No:	PO/PRP/01 Version 2.0 (Revision 1) June 2020
Purpose:	The purpose of this Procedure 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 by all interested parties, and to ensure the coherence of the practice of the Editorial Team, which is genuinely difficult to unify due to the physical distance and the 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 the transparency of the practice and to allow authors to line up with the requirements of the Editorial Team.
Original Commencement Date:	February 2017
Date of Next Review:	As requested by the interested parties
Revision History:	Revision 1
Procedure Author(s):	Octavia Căruntu, Editor Andreea Stanciu, 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 devising this Procedure, 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 aim of the review process is to make sure that good scientific work is published. It plays a vital role in maintaining the high standards of *International Journal of Mechatronics and Applied Mechanics* and the contributions received with the view to be included in IJOMAM are reviewed following the procedure outlined in this document.

Special Issues are based on different peer review procedures involving Guest Editors. They are particular cases and have a different status. Authors who want to publish papers in special issues will receive full details of the review process – on request – at the given time. You can contact us at any time at incdmtm@incdmtm.ro and andreea.popescu@incdmtm.ro

2. Review Process Methodology

The current guidelines specify the procedures and the methodology underlying the running of the review process for paper inclusion in the *International Journal of Mechatronics and Applied Mechanics*.

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

The review process is confidential and the identities of the persons who review papers will not be revealed to the authors. Also, the submitted manuscripts are treated as confidential documents. Thus, the entire evaluation process is based on a **double blind review** for optimal results.

First Hand Manuscript Evaluation

All papers need to be submitted by e-mail (via incdmtm@incdmtm; CC: 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 for consideration to one of the two Co-Editors-in-chief of the two main areas and are sent for review to the Associate Editors. Authors of manuscripts that are rejected in the initial evaluation stage will normally be informed on short notice.

Associate Editor Evaluation

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

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

The entire review process involves the following steps:

1. There are two journal issues per year. The Editorial Team begins receiving paper starting with the 1st of January and the process continues throughout the entire year until both issues are full.

2. A contribution is received by e-mail by the Editor-in-chief and the Editorial Team (via incdmtm@incdmtm and andreea.popescu@incdmtm.ro). Should a paper be not suited for the purpose of the journal, it is rejected in this very stage. The verdict is immediately communicated to the contributor.
3. Should the number of submissions received at a given time be excessive and exceed the processing capacity of the Editorial team, than the Editor-in-chief and the Editorial Team retain their right to ask the contributor to re-submit the paper at a future date that will be communicated to the latter.
4. The paper is assigned to the Co-editor-in-chief belonging to the appropriate area, who is to decide whether the paper will go for the next step of evaluation or not. The paper can be also rejected in this stage. The verdict is immediately communicated to the contributor.
5. The Co-editor-in-chief will assign the paper for revision to two of the Co-editor of his choice. The author(-s)'s names and affiliation(-s) will be obliterated from the file.
6. Each reviewer will fill the evaluation form and will send it back to the co-editor.
7. The final decision on paper acceptance/rejection is attained when consensus on this matter is obtained between the two reviewers. Sometimes, reviewers can ask for paper improvements and they need to be performed in a timely matter for the paper to be accepted for publication. Failure to comply with these requirements will results in the rejection of the paper.
8. The Editorial Team communicates the verdict on paper acceptance or rejection to the corresponding author as soon as possible.
9. The author pays the publication fee and notifies the Editorial Team in this regard.
10. The Editorial Team confirms the payment and issues financial documents and the publication proofs (upon request).
11. The paper is published in one of the two issues that are generated each year.
12. On special occasions, extra issues are published, but they have a particular status and they are usually related with the organization of events by our international partners wo apply for publishing with IJOMAM.

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 the appropriate existing literature;
- Adequacy of methodology, analysis and interpretation;
- Clear, concise writing style;
- Proper 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 a high 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 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 used in the paper is good.

- **Presentation and organization of the paper**
 - ✓ The paper follows the style guidelines suggested by the Editorial Team.
 - ✓ The manuscript is well organized.
 - ✓ The tables and figures are used effectively and complement the text.
 - ✓ The references observe the template and are properly chosen.

4. Miscellaneous

The decision to accept or to reject a paper belongs entirely to the Reviewers. The Editorial Team has no say in this matter for objectivity reasons. A paper is published only if the two reviewers that are assigned to it reach an agreement should one opt for rejection and the other for acceptance in the initial state.

The work of the Reviewers is not remunerated, granting this process a great level of objectivity.

The authors sign a Copyright Transfer Agreement by which they transfer the copyright to the paper to IJOMAM. However, they retain certain rights that are specified in the Agreement.

The authors state and take full responsibility for this statement that the paper is not subject to plagiarism and that all sources used in drawing the submitted paper are properly cited, as according to scientific best practices in the academic field and ethical considerations. However, it is up to the Editor and the Editorial Team and the Reviewers to make sure that these aspects are observed by further checking the contributions with a special software that detects plagiarism. **Authors who break the ethical conduct rules can no longer submit papers for evaluation sooner than in five years' time from the date of plagiarism detected.** A maximum of **5% plagiarism rate** as detected by the specialized software is considered acceptable considering the complexity of plagiarism forms (apart from the strict identification of plagiarism with verbatim reproduction of the works of others) and the possible software errors.

All rejected papers can be re-submitted for evaluation in the next issue provided that they are improved according to the suggestions of the Reviewers. Papers that are re-submitted and that fail to comply with this provision can no longer be submitted for a next round of evaluation and further papers by the same author(-s) are rejected automatically.

Papers need to have high quality graphics. Reproducing graphics with no permission falls in the responsibility of the author who submits a paper. **The ideal resolution for photos is that of at least 300 DPI, while a resolution below 200 DPI is not acceptable and leads to the rejection of a paper.**

Appendix 1 PAPER ASSESSMENT FORM – For Reviewers Only

- Paper Title:

- Paper Authors: This section is obliterated by the Editorial Team.

- Keywords:

PAPER EVALUATION REPORT

Evaluation Result:

Score:

Criteria

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

Please note that 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 shortcomings.
- 2 – Fair. The paper addresses the criterion, but there are significant shortcomings.
- 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

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

Further Comments by the Reviewer (Not mandatory):