

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 muresandaniel01@yahoo.com, iuliangoidescu@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 muresandaniel01@yahoo.com, iuliangoidescu@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 **muresandaniel01@yahoo.com**, **iuliangoidescu@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 COUNCIL

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

1. Prof. dr. Dan Mișu, Cluj Napoca, România
2. Prof. dr. Daniela Fodor Cluj Napoca, România
3. Prof. dr. Gabriela Zaharie, Cluj Napoca, România
4. Prof. dr. Sorin Ducea, Cluj Napoca, România
5. Conf. dr. Doru Diclescu, Cluj Napoca, România
6. Conf. dr. Gheorghe Cruciat, Cluj Napoca, România
7. Conf. dr. Răzvan Ciortea, Cluj Napoca, România
8. Conf. dr. Ioana Cristina Rotar, Cluj Napoca, România
9. Șef L. dr. Gabriela Caracostea, Cluj Napoca, România
10. Șef L. dr. Mihai Surcel, Cluj Napoca, România
11. Șef L. dr. Melinda Matyas, Cluj Napoca, România
12. Prof. dr. Liliana Novac, Craiova, România

PEER REVIEW



EDITING RULES (PEER-REVIEW PROTOCOL)

13. Prof. dr. Nicolae Cernea, Craiova, România
14. Conf. dr. Costin Berceanu, Craiova, România
15. Conf. dr. Dominic Iliescu, Craiova, România
16. Conf. dr. Ștefania Tudorache, Craiova, România
17. Prof. dr. Demetra Socolov, Iași, România
18. Prof. dr. Mircea Onofriescu, Iași, România
19. Prof. dr. Răzvan Socolov, Iași, România
20. Prof. dr. Ștefan Buțureanu, Iași, România
21. Conf. dr. Dragoș Nemescu, Iași, România
22. Prof. dr. Bela Szabo, Târgu Mureș, România
23. Prof. dr. Claudiu Mărginean, Târgu Mureș, România
24. Prof. dr. Oana Cristina Mărginean, Târgu Mureș, România
25. Conf. dr. Mihai Emil Căpîlna, Târgu Mureș, România
26. Șef L. Claudiu Molnar, Târgu Mureș, România
27. Prof. dr. Dorin Grigoraș, Timișoara, România
28. Prof. dr. Ioan Sas, Timișoara, România
29. Prof. dr. Marius Craina, Timișoara, România
30. Conf. dr. Elena Bernad, Timișoara, România
31. Conf. dr. Laurențiu Pirtea, Timișoara, România
32. Prof. dr. Vlad Tica, Constanța, România

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD

1. Prof. Aris Antsaklis (Grecia)
2. Prof. Panos Antsaklis (Grecia)
3. Prof. Apostolos Athanasiades (Grecia)
4. Prof. Sinan Beksac (Turcia) Prof. Frank Cervenak (SUA)
5. Prof. Vincentio Dadario (Italia)
6. Prof. Valenti Friptu (Moldova)
7. Prof. Asim Kurjak (Croatia)
8. Prof. Eberhart Merz (Germania)
9. Prof. Edgar Mocanu (Irlanda)
10. Prof. Giovanni Moni (Italia)
11. Prof. dr. Horace Roman (Franța)