Evaluation procedure

The potential reviewers, well known national or international specialists, were directly contacted; their support was called on and they were invited to fill the attached Acceptance Form. By signing this form, the reviewers have confirmed their agreement with the principles and the rules for the reviewing process as well as with the evaluation criteria for the submitted papers.
A reviewers database was created, with the expertise areas.
The Editorial board sends to two reviewers each blind paper (without author names and affiliation).
The acceptance of the papers is done accordingly to the average evaluation score (the maximum is 6):
- score between 4 and 6: paper accepted;
- score between 3 and 4: the paper is sent to a third reviewer. The decision is taken by the Editorial board after this third evaluation.
- the papers having an average score less than 3 are rejected; eventually, the authors are advised to make a major reconsideration of the study / paper and to improve the work.

The evaluation criteria (included into the Acceptance form delivered to the reviewing team) are:

1. **Originality:** Not known or experienced before. A technique or a method not used before. Has this or similar work been previously reported? Are the problems and/or approaches in the paper completely new?
2. **Novelty:** According this criterion, it is not necessary for the paper to develop new techniques, or to generate new knowledge, but it should, at least, apply, or combine, them in a fresh and novel way or shed some new light on their applicability in a certain domain.
3. **Innovation:** A new product, process or service based on new or known technologies, methods or methodologies. Known technologies and techniques might be combined to generate new product or service with potential users in the market. What defines an innovation is a new kind of possible users of a product or a service, not necessarily new knowledge, new techniques, new technologies, new methods, or new applications. Innovation is related to new uses or new markets.
4. **Relevance:** Importance, usefulness, and/or applicability of the ideas, methods and/or techniques described in the paper.
5. **Appropriateness:** Suitability, agreeableness, compatibility, congruity, and adequacy of the paper to the areas and topics of the journal or the conference. Would the article perhaps better be presented at another conference?
6. **Significance:** Importance and noteworthiness of the ideas, methods and techniques used and/or described in the article. The problem approached in the article should be interesting and natural, and not just be chosen by the authors because it can be attacked by their methods. What it is presented in the article is not just obvious and trivial ideas.
7. **Quality:** Scientific, technical, and/or methodological soundness of the article. Correctness of results, proofs and/or reflections. Inclusion in the articles of details that allow checking the correctness of the results or citations of articles where can be found the proof or parts of it.
8. **Presentation:** Adequate organization of the article and the language used in it, as to make its content clear, easily readable and understandable. Clarity in what has been achieved by the author of the article. Even technical papers on a narrow topic should be written such that non-experts can comprehend the main contribution of the paper and the methods employed. The paper shouldn't just be a litany of deep but obscure theorems. The information of the paper should be available to the reader with a minimum of effort.