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
****

RECOMMENDATIONS

on the Peer Review of Scientific Articles Submitted for Publication in the Scientific Journal "EcoSoEn"

Recommendations on the review of scientific articles submitted for publication in the Scientific Journal "EcoSoEn"

The process of reviewing scientific articles, in accordance with the Journal's Guidelines on Article Review, involves several essential stages to ensure scientific quality and relevance. These stages are as follows:

1. Receipt and Initial Examination

The Editorial Committee of the Journal receives manuscripts from authors and subjects them to an initial examination by the Executive Editors.

This preliminary review aims to determine whether the manuscripts comply with the mission, objectives, and concept of the Journal.

2. Anti-Plagiarism Check (Semiplagiat.ro)

Articles are subjected to an anti-plagiarism procedure to ensure the originality of the content.

Manuscripts that do not meet this requirement or do not correspond to the Journal's profile are rejected and are not further considered.

3. Reviewer Evaluation

Manuscripts that pass the first two stages are sent for evaluation to external reviewers.

They analyze the papers in terms of originality, quality of research design, methodology used, significance of results for the field, clarity of the text, etc.

Reviewers provide recommendations to the editor regarding publication, rejection, or the need for revision.

4. Proposals for Revision and Editorial Decision

If reviewers recommend revisions, manuscripts are returned to authors together with suggestions for improvement.

The final decision belongs to the Editorial Committee, which takes into account the reviewers' recommendations.

5. Acceptance of Manuscripts

Manuscripts assessed by reviewers as suitable for publication are accepted directly, while those requiring revisions are conditionally accepted until the revisions are completed and approved by the Editorial Committee.

This rigorous process ensures scientific integrity and the quality of articles published in the Journal, contributing to the advancement of knowledge in the field.

Importance of the Review Process

The review process is essential for maintaining high standards of quality and scientific integrity in academic publications.

Reviews provide a detailed assessment of manuscripts based on well-defined criteria, as follows:

1. Relevance, Scientific Novelty, and Originality

The importance and relevance of the chosen topic for the scientific community are evaluated, as well as the unique contribution of the article to the field of study.

2. Correspondence between the Title, Content, and Bibliography

It is verified whether the title correctly and concisely reflects the essence of the paper and whether the bibliography is adequate and up to date.

3. Relevance of the Abstract and Keywords

The abstract must provide a clear and accurate overview of the article, while the keywords must be representative of the addressed topic.

4. Scientific Quality of the Article

The depth of research, validity of the methodology, clarity of argumentation, and persuasive power of the presented data are analyzed.

5. Stylistic and Graphic Quality of the Article

The coherence and clarity of presentation are evaluated, as well as the correctness and consistency of graphical elements (tables, figures, charts).

6. Completeness of Sources and Bibliographic References

The bibliography must be extensive and reflect all relevant sources supporting the presented arguments.

7. Theoretical Processing and Critical Interpretation

The author's ability to integrate existing theories and provide original interpretations or constructive criticism is assessed.

8. Reflection of Objectives and Justification of Conclusions

It is important that the article has clearly defined objectives and that all conclusions are solidly justified and derived from the presented data and analyses.

Reviewers use these criteria to provide a comprehensive evaluation, identifying both strengths and aspects requiring improvement.

The detailed review helps authors improve their manuscripts before publication, ensuring that the final article meets scientific standards and contributes significant value to its field of study.

(Review Model – Annex 1)

Table 1

Criterion	Assessment "accepted for publication"	Assessment "conditionally accepted"	Assessment "rejected"
1	The topic addressed in the article is relevant, corresponds to scientific interests and the needs of practice. The relevance of the research is confirmed by the author(s) through an analysis of studies on the topic, highlighting researchers' interest in the issue at the contemporary stage. The topic analyzed by the author(s) in this article is relatively established and has been previously studied by other researchers, but it remains relevant due to the manifestation of the problem at the current stage and the need for theoretical and practical solutions. The research demonstrates scientific novelty, being an important topic with practical implications, insufficiently investigated in our country / in general. The novelty of the topic consists in the distinct methodology presented. The novelty of the topic consists in the conclusions derived from the performed analyses. This article combines analysis techniques that were relatively new at the time of publication. This article sheds new light on the analyzed field. The article is original, highlighting the reasoned	In general, it corresponds to the criteria described in the previous section, but the relevance is not sufficiently argued with results that could be implemented in practical activity. Scientific novelty is methodologically argued, however it is not formulated conclusively and is not clearly highlighted in the text of the article. More extensive citation of bibliographic sources on the topic is required, especially those reflecting contemporary researchers' interest in the issue addressed in the article. The author(s) do not mention the novelty and originality of the factual data presented in the article.	The article is not relevant, reflecting a problem that does not correspond to the social (socio-economic) reality, and presents in the theoretical analysis outdated bibliographic sources irrelevant to contemporary academic concerns and to the practical field. The research presented in the article does not contain scientific novelty and brings nothing essentially new to contemporary theory and practice. The article lacks originality and represents a compilation of literature without the author's own analysis and without well-argued conclusions.

Criterion	Assessment "accepted for publication"	Assessment "conditionally accepted"	Assessment "rejected"
	opinions of the author(s), illustrated by results of theoretical and experimental/practical analysis. The originality of the article lies in the variety of new methods used by the author(s) and in the quality of the conclusions. The author(s) use valid research methods known in the field, but adapt them to the research problem, combining them in an original manner. The article demonstrates originality, being based on theoretical analyses and on factual data analyses carried out by the author(s).		
2	The title of the article corresponds to its content and is supported by the theoretical-applied analysis and the cited bibliographic sources.	The title of the article requires revision, specifying the content of the theoretical (theoretical-practical) research reflected.	The title does not fully correspond to the content. The cited bibliography does not directly refer to the theoretical-practical aspect reflected by the title of the article.
3	The abstract reflects the content of the article, is formulated clearly and concisely, and its reading informs the readers about the problem, purpose, objectives, and outcomes of the investigation. The keywords are relevant to the content of the article and to the research presented in it.	The abstract requires revision because it does not fully clarify the presented research. The keywords do not fully reflect the scientific problem of the article, and they need to be supplemented.	The abstract is not methodologically correct; it presents a random fragment from which the content is not clear.
4	The organization of the article is classical and scientifically correct. Distinct parts are included: annotation, introduction, methodology and methods, research results and discussion, conclusions, and references.	The organization generally corresponds to the assessments in the previous section, but a more complete and detailed presentation of the methods used is needed. In certain moments, a more complete and detailed explanation of the research results is required, as	The article is not organized correctly from a methodological point of view; the structure is diffuse; the theoretical-conceptual analysis, methodology and methods, results, and conclusions are not

Criterion	Assessment "accepted for publication"	Assessment "conditionally accepted"	Assessment "rejected"
	Paragraphs and subparagraphs are used appropriately for presenting, defining, and clarifying the analyzed issues. There is a logical flow of presentation and argumentation (starting from presenting the model, its specifications, the step-by-step application of the proposed method, and then applying it with interpretation of the obtained results), which makes the article easy to follow. The objectives of the article are appropriately addressed and achieved through the presented research.	well as specifying how the objectives were achieved or concretizing the conclusions.	presented consistently. Errors of quantitative and qualitative analysis of results are present. The objectives are not fully and correctly formulated and are not correlated with the research results. The results and conclusions are not justified.
5	The language used is scientifically correct and can be easily read and understood by specialists in the field. It is admitted that for non-specialists it is more difficult to follow the applied methodology and the obtained results. This is an article with a pronounced theoretical or applied, or theoretical-applied character, applying research methods and techniques to determine the parameters of the described model. The authors' style and expression are clear and coherent, without grammatical or wording errors. The figures and tables accompanying the analyses are correctly designed, clear, and illustrative, highlighting the main elements of the research.	The language used is scientifically correct and is understood by specialists in the field, but sometimes stylistic and grammatical errors occur. The authors' style and expression are clear and coherent. The figures and tables accompanying the analyses are correctly designed, clear, and illustrative, highlighting the main elements of the research. However, in some tables the presented variables and the numerical/factual material are not clear.	The article is prepared carelessly from a technical, stylistic, and grammatical point of view. The language does not correspond to scientific writing. The information is not coherent, and the research results are not adequately illustrated with tables and figures.

Criterion	Assessment "accepted for publication"	Assessment "conditionally accepted"	Assessment "rejected"
6	The article provides a sufficient list of bibliographic sources on the topic; it contains many recent publications, but also refers to the authors of basic concepts. The sources reflect research conducted in national science and in the international context. The bibliography is complete, citing representative works for the addressed topic. Citation is correct. The sources are ordered according to accepted criteria for presenting references.	The bibliographic sources refer to the research topic and are sufficient in number. Although recent publications are cited, some valuable works relevant to the research problem are not considered. Citation is correct. The sources are ordered according to accepted criteria for presenting references.	The bibliographic sources do not always reflect the topic of the article; the most renowned authors in the investigated field are not cited. Considerable revision of the bibliography and in-text citations is required.
7	The theoretical analysis is argued, methodologically correct, and interpretative. It allows identifying ideas for study and organizing the research. The author has a critical and responsible vision regarding the clarified concepts, presents their own ideas, and contributes to conceptual development according to the object of research.	The theoretical analysis is argued, methodologically correct, and critical. The author shows responsibility regarding the clarified concepts and correct citation of authors, but does not always express their own ideas. The conclusions do not fully illustrate the theoretical outcome of the research.	The theoretical analysis is not sufficiently argued and critical. The author does not correctly cite the used bibliographic sources, does not express their own ideas and conclusions. The conclusions do not illustrate the theoretical outcome of the research.
8	The article achieved its purpose; conclusions are justified, logical, and illustrated. It contains conclusions that develop knowledge of the research object. It contains conclusions that contribute to the practical sector. The research results and conclusions have theoretical and applied value.	The article achieved its purpose; conclusions are justified, logical, and illustrated. A generalized conclusion of theoretical and practical character is required.	The article did not achieve its purpose and does not present justified conclusions. The research results and conclusions do not have theoretical and applied value.

Examples of Formulating Observations and Recommendations

1. present the scientific novelty of the conducted research;
2. illustrate the relevance of the research with relevant and recent bibliographic sources (statistical, documentary);
3. demonstrate the originality of the research through the author(s)' conclusions derived from the investigation;
4. revise the article title, bringing it into correspondence with the content;
5. comply with methodological and scientific requirements when formulating the title and abstract;
6. revise the abstract and review the list of keywords;
7. provide a more detailed description of the methods;
8. analyze the results more broadly;
9. formulate conclusions correlated with the research objectives;
10. revise the text stylistically and grammatically;
11. revise tables and figures;
12. supplement the bibliography with contemporary authors and relevant publications from the Republic of Moldova and internationally;
13. provide interpretative analyses in the review of research in the field;
14. supplement the conclusions with a theoretical, theoretical-practical conclusion resulting from the research presented in the article, etc.

Executive Editors

Svetlana RUSNAC, PhD, Associate Professor
Igor BALAN, PhD, Associate Professor
Olga BLAGORAZUMNAIA, PhD, Associate Professor
Elena ROBU, PhD, Associate Professor