

PEER-REVIEW PROCESS
REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL COMPARATIVE MANAGEMENT
(RICM)

Review of International Comparative Management (RICM) is one of the first publications approaching management field in a global and international view. RICM is published as a consequence of co-operation between **Excellency Romanian Center for Comparative Management Studies** and **ASE Publishing House** from Bucharest.

Since 2007, the review appears with a new design, targeting to be the main Romanian review specialized in management field. The frequency is of **four issues per year**, dedicated to the **general management topics**. Additionally, it will be published **the fifth issue**, volume that will be dedicated to **international comparative management**.

The following stages are used in the peer-review process:

1. Preliminary Stage

All submitted articles must pass through the *peer-review process* in order to be published in Review of International Comparative Management (RICM).

The articles will be sent to the Editorial Board using on-line correspondence (by e-mail) at cnesmc@yahoo.com. Within 7 days from the on-line correspondence submission date the author will receive a confirmation e-mail.

Also, the article will receive a unique identification number, which will be used during the review process and also during the publishing process, ensuring an objective assessment of the paper.

The articles written by authors who haven't earned the scientific degree "Ph. D" (or any other equivalent) will be assessed to the peer-review process only if the article is accompanied by a written recommendation from an expert in the field of activity the article refers to.

2. The peer-review objective

The peer-review objective is to reach an adequate scientific level for all the published articles and also to bring-up new significant contributions in the approached fields of activity.

3. Defining peer-review procedures

The peer-review procedures applied by Review of International Comparative Management (RICM) are:

- ❖ "Editorial Board Peer-Review" (the assessment is performed by members of the Editorial Board). All Editorial Board members are also members of the academic community.
- ❖ "Expert Peer-Review" (the scientific assessment is performed by members of the Scientific Council). All Scientific Council members have earned the scientific degree "Ph. D." and are experts in their fields of activity.

4. Editorial Board Peer-Review – detailed presentation

The articles submitted, in order to be published in RICM, are initially reviewed by the Editorial Board members (using the *Editorial Board Peer-Review* procedure). The goal of this procedure is to determine the manner in which the submitted articles integrate with the reviews' standards, characteristics and also field of activity.

Editorial Board of Review of International Comparative Management (RICM) consists of:

- ▶ Marian Năstase – Editor in Chief – *Senior Lecturer Ph. D.*, The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies – Faculty of Management;
- ▶ Daniel Jiroveanu – Deputy Chief Editor – *Professor-Assistant*, The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies – Faculty de Management;
- ▶ Cătălina Radu – Deputy Chief Editor – *Professor-Assistant*, The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies – Faculty de Management.
- ▶ Dan Ardelea – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Polytechnic University, Bucharest, Romania
- ▶ Emil Cazan – *Prof. Ph. D.*, West University, Timișoara, Romania
- ▶ Oprean Constantin – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Lucian Blaga University, Sibiu, Romania
- ▶ Miron Dumitru – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Vice-Rector of The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania
- ▶ Ionescu Gheorghe – *Prof. Ph. D.*, West University, Timișoara, Romania
- ▶ Filion Louis Jacques – *Prof. Ph. D.*, HEC Montreal, Montreal, Canada
- ▶ Hanns J. Pichler – *Prof. Ph. D.*, President of Institute for SME Research, University of Economics and Business Administration, Vienna, Austria
- ▶ Neck Philip – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Southern Cross University, Lismore, Australia
- ▶ Ion Plumb – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Vice-Rector of The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania
- ▶ Ion Popa – *Senior Lecturer Ph. D.*, The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania
- ▶ Lester Lloyd Reason – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Anglia Polytechnic University, England
- ▶ Liviu Ilies – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

- ▶ Kari Liuhto – *Prof. Ph. D.*, School of Economics and Business Administration, Turku, Finland
- ▶ Adrian Curaj – *Prof. Ph. D.*, EMBA, Polytechnic University, Bucharest, Romania
- ▶ Michael Miles – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Canada
- ▶ Ovidiu Nicolescu – *Prof. Ph. D.*, General Manager of ERNCCMS, The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania
- ▶ Bibu Nicolae – *Prof. Ph. D.*, West University, Timișoara, Romania
- ▶ Adriana Olaru – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Dunărea de Jos University, Galați, Romania
- ▶ Ion Gh. Roșca – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Rector of The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania
- ▶ Jaume Valls Pasola – *Prof. Ph. D.*, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
- ▶ Corneliu Russu – *Prof. Ph. D.*, Petroleum – Gas University, Ploiești, Romania
- ▶ Kirill Todorov – *Prof. Ph. D.*, University of National and World Economy, Sofia, Bulgaria
- ▶ Ion Verboncu – *Prof. Ph. D.*, The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania
- ▶ Al. Isaac-Maniu – *Prof. Ph. D.*, The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania
- ▶ Mihai Pricop – *Prof. Ph. D.*, The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania
- ▶ Ioan Radu – *Prof. Ph. D.*, The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania
- ▶ Franco Gandolfi – *Prof. Ph. D.*, School of Global Leadership & Entrepreneurship, Regent University, Virginia Beach, USA

Editorial Board Peer-Review aims on the following editorial requests:

- the articles have to enclose thematically in the reviews' profile;
- materials have to bring out original items, with current interest;
- materials must have high scientific content;
- articles must be presented without political interests;
- articles must be presented without containing classified data;
- the author(s) can publish a single article in each issue of the review;
- material size has to be of 7-12 pages;
- an abstract of 100 - 150 words;
- 5 key words;
- JEL classification of the current article;
- quotations from literature has to be in an uniform style, both in text and in footnotes. In text: (Hofstede, 1997) or (Hofstede, 1997, pp 124);
- footnotes or references will have the next format: name, initial of first name, paper title, printing house, city of publishing, year of publishing;
- font type: Times New Roman;
- letters size: 12;
- space between lines: single;
- text editor: Microsoft Word.

The preliminary evaluation (Editorial Board Peer-Review) can be considered complete with the article inclusion in one of the specific topics of Review of International Comparative Management (RICM). These fields can be consulted by the authors on the website.

5. Expert Peer-Review – detailed presentation

“Expert Peer-Review” procedure is realized by two distinct scientific reviewers, who are members of the academic community and who earned the scientific degree of Prof Ph. D., Senior Lecturer Ph. D. or 1st and 2nd degree scientific researcher. If necessary, the article can be reviewed by a third scientific reviewer, from the members of RICM Scientific Council.

Scientific reviewers are chosen using the specialization criteria. The specialization should match with the field of activity in which the article was included after the “Editorial Board Peer-Review” procedure.

The appointed members from the Review of International Comparative Management (RICM) will receive, in advance, the material in order to be analyzed. The scientific meeting will be based on the use of the peer-review forms. During this scientific meetings one of the two (three) reviewers will be appointed leader and will have the responsibility for the accurateness and clarity of the information and also for the confidential transfer of information towards the Chief Editor of RICM.

The Expert Peer-Review assesses the article through the following scientific criteria:

- ✓ Scientific content quality
 - the correlation between the paper content and the scientific base;
 - the manner in which the analysis models are implemented in the material;
 - originality of the submitted subject.
- ✓ The paper relevance, impact and importance
 - the paper relevance upon academic research activities;
 - the paper impact upon the fields that have connexions with the article.
- ✓ Technical content quality
 - the relevance of bibliographic sources;
 - text clarity, text concision and text accuracy;
 - the lack of errors, wrong concepts and ambiguities in the presented paper.

The detailed presentation for the scientific criteria can be consulted on RICM peer-review form.

“Expert Peer-Review” scientific assessment process concludes by granting the paper with one of the following **qualificative**: “**accepted**”, “**accepted, with changes**”, or “**rejected**”. This qualificative is given by the scientific reviewers, using the previous presented criteria.

6. Peer-Review Form

Peer-Review form can be defined as the background of the peer-review process. Initially, this form has to be fill in by RICM Chief Editor, and, afterwards, by the appointed reviewers from the Scientific Council. The form will then be delivered back to the Editorial Board both for storage and for acknowledge of the author about the reviewers’ decision and possible suggestions.

7. Authors’ and Reviewers’ rights and responsibilities

Authors’ rights:

- a. The submitted papers authors have the right to keep in touch with the Editorial Board during the entire peer-review process in order to receive all the information regarding the stage of the process in which the material is.
- b. The papers authors have the right to request any extra information from the Scientific Council if the material is qualificative as “rejected” by the reviewers.
- c. During the peer-review process, authors’ identity is protected against the reviewers that are appointed to asses the article.
- d. The author has the right to request justifications if the deadlines, stipulated at point 8, are outrun.

Authors’ responsibilities:

- a. The authors have the responsibility to ensure that the orthographical correction was made before the submission of the articles.
- b. The authors have the responsibility to provide an adequate bibliography according to the reference materials;
- c. The authors have the responsibility to respect Law number 206/2004 concerning the fair-play in scientific research activities;
- d. The authors should declare on their own responsibility that the material hasn’t been published in other reviews.

Note: It is supposed that authors know and respect the Law concerning Copyright.

Reviewers' rights:

- a. The reviewers have private access to RICM website, using individualized accounts.
- b. The reviewers are authorized to make the necessary recommendations to the submitted article in order to reach the demanded requests.
- c. The reviewers have the autonomy to referee the material with the desired qualitative after realizing the scientific review.

Reviewers' responsibilities:

- a. The reviewers are authorized to referee only the material that where appointed to them.
- b. The reviewers have the responsibility not to outrun the deadlines stipulated at point 8. As a consequence, the peer-review form must be sent in an electronic form or using any other form.

Note: RICM Chief Editor has the authority to decide regarding publishing of the article in the review.

8. Deadlines

Confirmation for the received materials to the Editorial Board of RICM has to be made within 7 days.

Within 30 days from receiving the confirmation, the Editorial Board will send to the authors an e-mail notifying the decision about publishing the material.

The period of time between the confirmation e-mail and the publishing date of a material usually doesn't overrun 9 months, depending on the review periodicity, the already-existing article portfolio and the subjects approached by each review issue.

9. Final observations

- ❖ The scientific reviewers and the Editorial Board are not responsible for any orthographical and content mistakes.
- ❖ RICM will only publish articles with a scientific approach.

10. Contact

