

# IUS ROMANUM

## ONLINE JOURNAL FOR ROMAL LAW AND ROMAN LEGAL TRADITION

Published by the Law Faculty of Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

Boul. "Tsar Osvoboditel" 15, Rectorate, Room 308, Sofia, 1504, Bulgaria, [ius.romanum@abv.bg](mailto:ius.romanum@abv.bg)

### EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW PROCEDURE

Every article, sent for publishing by the author, is reviewed by the journal's Chief Editor and the secretaries for:

- the possible presence of any major or obvious scientific deficiencies;
- the article's accordance with the journal's publishing rules.

In case of a positive evaluation from this initial review, the procedure for external peer review begins. By decision of the Editorial board, the text is sent for evaluation to two reviewers - experts in the respective area, to which the article is related. The reviewers **must not** be members of the university, represented by the author. The journal uses the system of the so-called double blind peer review. In accordance with it, one of the secretaries send the text to the two reviewers in an anonymous form. The names of the reviewers are not revealed to the author. The members of the Editorial board, the secretaries and the reviewers are obliged to keep this activity in secret.

Within 20 days after receiving the article, the reviewers must give their evaluation by filling the Table for external peer review (see Application №1) and send all the materials back to the secretaries.

### Criteria for external peer review and evaluation:

The reviewers must evaluate:

- the originality of the topic and the article;
- the article's relevance to the subject of the journal;
- the article's methodology;
- the article's linguistic accuracy;
- the quality of the translation;
- the stability of the argumentation;
- the clarity and fullness of the exposure;
- the relevant use of bibliographic and jurisprudence references.

### Result:

As a result of the external peer review procedure the article can be:

- accepted for publishing;
- returned to the author for editing changes, specifically pointed out by the reviewer. The Editorial board of the journal evaluates the adequacy of the editing changes and makes a proposal for publishing the article;
- denied for publishing.

If the two reviewers have a different opinion, the Editorial board takes the final decision.

The publishing is made by the decision of the Editorial board on the proposal of the Chief Editor.

## TABLE FOR EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

TABLE №:

Date:

<b>Article heading:</b>	
<b>Name, qualification and signature of the reviewer:</b>	

**Analytical evaluation:** *Mark with "X" the box, which corresponds to your evaluation for each criteria.*

<b>Evaluation marks:</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>Originality of the topic and the article:</b>						
<b>Relevance to the subject of the journal:</b>						
<b>Methodology:</b>						
<b>Linguistic accuracy:</b>						
<b>Translation quality:</b>						
<b>Stability of the argumentation:</b>						
<b>Clarity of the exposure:</b>						
<b>Fullness of the exposure:</b>						
<b>Relevant use of bibliographic and jurisprudence references:</b>						

**Final evaluation:** Should the article be published? *Mark with "X"*

<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes, after editing</b>

Editing recommendations:

--