

PEER REVIEW



EDITING RULES (PEER-REVIEW PROTOCOL)

The scientific quality of the published papers is secured by the impartial double blind peer-review process conducted by the editorial office.

The manuscripts will be received at the editorial office as an attachment in word format to an e-mail sent to doinacozman@gmail.com and to redactia@medichub.ro.

The papers sent to editorial office are analyzed in order to establish whether they correspond thematically with the journal's editorial policy. After positive editorial office decision, the manuscripts will be assigned a number and the registration number will be communicated as soon as possible to the authors by e-mail.

Note: it is mandatory that the authors send the correspondence e-mail.

After manuscript receipt, the corresponding author will receive a short e-mail confirming the receipt which will contain the registration number, the date the manuscript was received, and the fact that the manuscript was handed out to the subject editor (the specialized member of the Editorial Board). The Editor-in-chief or one of the deputy editors will hand the manuscript to the subject editors.

The initial responsibilities of the subject editors consist of verifying if the manuscript complies with the editing criteria.

- If the manuscript does not comply with the criteria, the subject editor will send a short email to the corresponding author, with the request to rewrite the manuscript according to the editorial criteria.
- If there are serious errors of content and/or editing, the manuscript will be rejected ab initio by the Editor-in-chief.
- If the manuscript complies from the beginning with the editing requirements, the subject editor chooses 2 peer-reviewers (either from those already accredited by the journal or from a number of new suggestions made by the author, in which case he conveys the proposal/s in order to be sent the approval letter acknowledging the quality of official reviewer of the journal), and it is mandatory that one of them belongs to an academic site other than the authors of the manuscript.

In the case that the authors formulated any objections against particular reviewers, these objections will be respected by the editors.

The subject editor (or the editorial board at the request of the subject editor) sends by e-mail to the peer reviewer the letter of request (demanding a review within 2 weeks), together with the anonymized manuscript.

The reviewers decision (approval with no changes, approval with major/minor changes, rejection) will be immediately communicated by e-mail to the corresponding author by the subject editor (the message will be sent in **CC to doinacozman@gmail.com and to redactia@medichub.ro**).

If the manuscript gets approval with the indication for changes, the anonymous comments of the reviewers will be sent together with the reviewers decision and a statement of the subject editor, which will be the synthesis of the reviewers' opinions.

PEER REVIEW



EDITING RULES (PEER-REVIEW PROTOCOL)

The corresponding author must send the improved manuscript within 4 weeks, together with a letter (Word document) as attachments to an e-mail where he/she responds item by item to the comments of the reviewers (the mail is addressed to **doinacozman@gmail.com** and to **redactia@medichub.ro**), specifying the manner in which the manuscript was modified.

The subject editor will forward the answer to the reviewers. If they are satisfied with the corresponding author's answer, they will send the subject editor the decision of approval for publication of the improved manuscript.

If the reviewers consider the corresponding author's answer is only partially satisfactory, they will request an additional review of the manuscript, the editing process following the same rules as in the case of the first revision.

If the peer reviewers consider that either on the first or the second revision, the corresponding author did not meet or poorly met the revision requests, they will deny the approval for publication, which will be communicated to the subject editor.

The decision for publication once taken by the reviewers, it will be communicate in editorial board meeting (an e-mail message (containing the final form of the manuscript and all the anonymous comments of the reviewers sent to all members of the editorial board that confirms that the attached article was accepted). During this meeting, the priority of the manuscript will be established, considering the following criteria:

- reviewers opinions;
- he degree of coverage for the different sections of the journal.

PEER REVIEW



EDITING RULES (PEER-REVIEW PROTOCOL)

PEER REVIEW COUNCIL

As editors and also on the behalf of the authors we are very grateful to the reviewers of the papers submitted to **Psihiatru.ro**. Their reviews were useful to maintain the quality of the papers and the high scientific standards of **Psihiatru.ro**. The following reviewers have been of great help:

1. Prof. dr. Doina COZMAN, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
2. Dr. Ovidiu ALEXINSCHI, Iași, Romania
3. Șef lucr. dr. Ciprian BĂCILĂ, Sibiu, Romania
4. Prof. dr. Roxana CHIRIȚĂ, Iași, Romania
5. Assoc. prof. dr. Horea George COMAN, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
6. Prof. dr. Iuliana DOBRESCU, Bucharest, Romania
7. Șef lucr. univ. dr. Lavinia DUICĂ, Sibiu, Romania
8. Assoc. prof. dr. Radu-Virgil ENĂTESCU, Timișoara, Romania
9. Șef lucr. dr. Ana GIURGIUCA, Bucharest, Romania
10. Asist. univ. dr. Cătălina GIURGI-ONCU, Timișoara, Romania
11. Șef lucr. dr. Dana-Cristina HERȚA, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
12. Dr. Bogdan Marius ISTRATE, Antwerpen, Belgium
13. Prof. dr. Jean-Pierre KAHN, Nancy, France
14. Conf. dr. Maria LADEA, Bucharest, Romania
15. Acad. Emeritus prof. dr. Mircea LĂZĂRESCU, Timișoara, Romania
16. Assoc. prof. dr. Alina MARIN, Kingston, Canada
17. Prof. dr. Dragoș MARINESCU, Craiova, Romania
18. Prof. dr. HC Juan E. MEZZICH, New York, USA
19. Dr. Davor MUCIC, Copenhaga, Danemark
20. Șef lucr. dr. Bogdan NEMEȘ, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
21. Prof. dr. Vincenzo Di NICOLA, Montreal, Canada
22. Prof. dr. Dan PRELIPCEANU Bucharest, Romania
23. Acad. prof. dr. HC Sorin RIGA Bucharest, Romania
24. Dr. Corneliu SANDA, Baltimore, USA
25. Prof. dr. HC Eliot SOREL, Washington DC, SUA
26. Dr. Roxana STOEAN, Bucharest, Romania
27. Prof. dr. Cătălina TUDOSE, Bucharest, Romania
28. Asist. univ. dr. Raluca TRIFU, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
29. Dr. Radu VRAȘTI, Ontario, Canada
30. Prof. dr. Danuta WASSERMAN, Stockholm, Suedia