

UNIVERSITATEA LIBERĂ INTERNAȚIONALĂ DIN MOLDOVA / FREE INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MOLDOVA

EcoSoEn, Revista Științifică / EcoSoEn, Scientific Journal

Științe Economice și Sociale / Economics and Social Sciences

ISSN 2587-344X, E-ISSN 2587-425X

52 Vlaicu Parcalab street, Chisinau, MD-2012, Republic of Moldova, ULIM

<https://ecosoen.ulim.md/> e-mail: ecosoen.ulim@gmail.com

GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS

of scientific articles submitted for publication
in the Scientific Journal “EcoSoEn”

1. Purpose of the Guide

This Guide establishes the criteria, stages, and standards of the academic peer review process for manuscripts submitted to the Scientific Journal “EcoSoEn”.

The main objective is to ensure the scientific quality, originality, academic integrity, and relevance of published articles.

2. Principles of Review

The evaluation process is conducted in accordance with the following principles:

- Objectivity – analysis is based exclusively on the content of the manuscript;
- Confidentiality – manuscripts and review reports are not disclosed;
- Academic integrity – zero tolerance for plagiarism;
- Constructive feedback – comments are formulated clearly, reasonably, and respectfully towards authors;
- Methodological transparency – recommendations are based on clear and verifiable criteria.

3. Stages of the Editorial Process

The editorial process includes the stages provided in the Journal Regulations:

1. Initial technical examination by Executive Editors (compliance with journal scope, article structure, plagiarism check);
2. Submission of the manuscript to two external reviewers under the “blind peer review” system;
3. Analysis of the manuscript based on the criteria of this Guide;
4. **Issuance of a recommendation:**
 - accepted;
 - accepted with revisions;
 - major revision;
 - rejected;
5. **Communication of revisions to authors and verification of their implementation;**
6. **Final editorial approval.**

4. Evaluation Criteria

The reviewer evaluates the manuscript according to the following criteria:

4.1. Relevance, Novelty, and Originality

The following aspects are analyzed:

- relevance of the topic for the scientific field;
- degree of originality of the theoretical or empirical approach;
- contribution of the study to the development of the field.

Minimum requirements:

- the bibliography reflects the current stage of research, including recent references from the last 5 years;
- representative studies from relevant national and international journals are cited.

4.2. Title, Abstract, and Keywords

The following are verified:

- consistency between the title and the content of the article;
- existence of a structured abstract (problem, purpose, methodology, results, conclusions);
- relevance of keywords.

4.3. Methodological Quality

The following are evaluated:

- adequacy and validity of the applied methods;
- clarity of methodological description;
- justification of the methodological approach;
- interpretation and analysis of data.

Indicators:

- clear definition of the research object and objectives;
- complete description of the sample (for empirical studies);
- justification of research instruments;
- analysis of results and critical discussion.

4.4. Theoretical Analysis and Argumentation

The following are analyzed:

- quality of literature synthesis;
- critical integration of theories;
- formulation of the author's position;

- consistency of argumentation.

4.5. Article Structure

The article must comply with the academic structure:

- Annotation/Abstract
- Introduction
- Methodology
- Results and Discussion
- Conclusions
- References

The following are verified:

- clarity of internal logic;
- use of paragraphs and subchapters;
- compliance with formatting requirements.

4.6. Language and Style

The following are assessed:

- stylistic and linguistic correctness;
- coherence and clarity of expression;
- quality of graphical elements (tables, figures).

4.7. Bibliography and Citation

The bibliography must:

- reflect works relevant to the article's topic;
- include national and international authors;
- contain predominantly recognized scientific publications;
- be cited correctly.

Editorial recommendation:

- use sources from the last 5 years, with emphasis on relevant literature in the field;
- cite articles from indexed journals (where possible).

4.8. Conclusions and Contribution

The following are evaluated:

- achievement of research objectives;
- consistency of conclusions with data and analysis;
- theoretical and/or practical contribution;
- formulation of future research directions.

5. Recommendations for Preparing the Review

The review must be concise, academic, and include:

1. General Evaluation

- overall impression of originality and relevance;
- level of methodological rigor.

2. Structured Observations

- strengths;
- aspects requiring improvement;
- specific recommendations.

3. Final Recommendation

- accepted for publication;
- conditionally accepted;
- major revision;
- rejected.

6. Recommended Formulations of Comments

The reviewer may use formulations such as:

- “It is recommended to supplement the bibliography with recent studies published in the last 5 years.”
- “The methodology requires a more detailed description.”
- “The conclusions should be explicitly correlated with the objectives of the study.”
- “Expansion of the discussion of the obtained results is requested.”

7. Ethical Standards for Reviewers

The reviewer:

- declares the absence of conflicts of interest;
- does not use information from the manuscript for personal purposes;

- reports suspicions of plagiarism;
- maintains confidentiality.

8. Review Deadline

The standard deadline for completing the review is 14 days from the date of receipt of the manuscript.

9. Supporting Documents

This Guide is applied together with:

- Editorial Regulations of the EcoSoEn Journal;
- Review Template (Annex 1);
- Review Recommendations (Annex 2).

10. Final Provisions

10.1 This Guide for Reviewers enters into force on the date of its approval by the Senate of the Free International University of Moldova and becomes an integral part of the editorial procedures of the Scientific Journal "EcoSoEn".

10.2 The Guide applies to all manuscripts submitted for publication in the "EcoSoEn" Journal in all fields covered by the publication, regardless of the type of article (theoretical, applied, experimental, case study, review).

10.3 The provisions of this Guide are supplemented by the Editorial Regulations of the Journal, ULIM's internal quality assurance policies, as well as international standards and recommendations on academic ethics and evaluation (ESG, COPE, Scopus/WoS).

10.4 Any situation not provided for in this document shall be resolved by the Editorial Committee of the Journal in accordance with the principles of academic ethics and editorial transparency.

10.5 Amendments and updates to this Guide shall be made periodically, at the proposal of the Editorial Committee or as a result of recommendations issued during external evaluation processes, and shall be approved by decision of the ULIM Senate.

10.6 Reviewers, authors, and members of the Editorial Committee are obliged to comply with the provisions of this Guide in order to ensure a transparent, fair, and quality-oriented editorial process.

10.7 This Guide is published on the official website of the Journal and is transmitted, together with the review invitation, to all reviewers involved in the evaluation process.

REVIEW
of the article entitled

submitted for publication in the Scientific Journal "EcoSoEn"

Nr.	CRITERIA	CONCLUSIONS / COMMENTS
1.	Relevance of the topic, scientific novelty, and originality of the article	
2.	Correspondence between the article title, content, and bibliography	
3.	Relevance of the abstract and keywords	
4.	Scientific quality of the article	
5.	Clarity and stylistic coherence of the text, graphical aspects	
6.	Completeness of sources and bibliographic references (including recent sources and those from prestigious journals)	
7.	Theoretical processing and analysis, critical and interpretative involvement of the author (presence of sources, avoidance of automatically generated content)	

8.	Reflection of the objective and argumentation of conclusions (clarity and relevance of conclusions, avoidance of repetition)	
9.	General observations regarding the structure and content of the article \nCompliance with typesetting requirements \nPresence of information regarding institutional affiliation and the Creative Commons license	
10.	Accuracy and diversity of bibliographic references (uniform format, recent sources, balance between types of sources)	
11.	Scientific rigor of the conclusions	
12.	Recommendations (minor/major revision, acceptance, additional verification for plagiarism/self-plagiarism)	
13.	Reviewer: Name, Surname, academic title, scientific/teaching rank, institution	
	Signature	

UNIVERSITATEA LIBERĂ INTERNAȚIONALĂ DIN MOLDOVA / FREE INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MOLDOVA

EcoSoEn, Revista Științifică / EcoSoEn, Scientific Journal

Științe Economice și Sociale / Economics and Social Sciences

ISSN 2587-344X, E-ISSN 2587-425X

52 Vlaicu Parcalab street, Chisinau, MD-2012, Republic of Moldova, ULIM

<https://ecosoen.ulim.md/> e-mail: ecosoen.ulim@gmail.com