

***Peer-review policy***

ALLRO advocates the open peer-review systems. It means that the sender of the manuscript appears with her/his name when the manuscript is sent by the reviews editor to the peer-reviewers.

We have weighed up the pros and cons of masked author identity in the first stage versus open identity of manuscript sender throughout both stages of publishing. We totally agree with the masked review policy as a necessary tool for the warranty of objective, unbiased evaluations. However, guided by the purpose of our journal above all, we have resorted to the open, unmasked review. The authors must assume their ideas and be able to defend them against critical evaluations. It is more challenging for the authors to appear with their names from the beginning. This way the journal aims to retain some of the benefits of the writer-reader relationship. Even a text of criticism and/or a research article, even a book review is a form of creation. The peer-reviewer enters a genuine dialogue with the text. The sent manuscript always becomes enriched by being read, assessed and by having this dialogue with a professional reader. On the other hand, unsure senders of poor manuscripts are urged to be more rigorous, since they are more exposed this way, with their names written on the papers.

***Author-reviewer mediation***

The author-peer-reviewer mediation is not a 'blind' one. The parity (author knowing her/his peer-reviewers) is achieved by our publishing of the complete list of reviewers, every other issue. We, ALLRO executive editors, cannot assume to mediate a face-to-face encounter between the author and the peer-reviewers. Some authors have difficulties in accepting criticism. They should know that it is a personal attitude and it cannot call into question the good intentions of the peer-reviewers. After the journal is printed, if a published author wants to contact a peer reviewer for a constructive dialogue, that is possible.

***Print stages and peer-review procedure:***

The preparation of the new issue of ALLRO has two stages: the preparation of the draft issue and the turning of the draft issue into the finite print work.

The coordination role for the first stage belongs to the reviews editors. They elaborate and follow the chart of distributing the manuscripts to the peer-reviewers. Each manuscript has two peer-reviewers assigned. There are situations when a third peer-reviewer with competences in the language of the manuscript is required.

The peer-reviewers send to the reviews editors the filled-in form with their evaluation concerning the publication, their comments and suggestions for correction, their indications about the parts that need revision. The reviews editors pass on the indications for revisions, the corrections and suggestions to the manuscript sender. The reviews editors keep all the forms filled-in by the peer-reviewers in a special file, in print form. While the authors are expected to improve their manuscripts with the suggested corrections, the reviews editors, together with the section editors, prepare a draft of the new issue of the journal with the manuscripts accepted for publication by the peer-reviewers. The reviews editors manage all the necessary steps of the first

stage. They are helped by the section-editors with the draft issue. When the authors return their manuscripts with the included corrections, the reviews editors check the overall congruency of the revisions with the indications or comments of the forms filled-in by the peer-reviewers. They decide if the manuscript should be sent again to the peer-reviewers for a second evaluation. In cases of major revisions, the improved manuscript is definitely sent for a second time to the peer-reviewers.

For the second stage, that of turning the draft into a printed journal, the managing role is that of the editor-in-chief, who, assisted by the associate editor-in-chief, will ensure the correct distribution of roles among the editorial team and will ensure the clarity of the contents. The editor-in-chief manages all practical and literary aspects of ALLRO. The collaboration with the advisory board, the print supervision, and the distribution of the journal are achieved by the editor-in-chief.

The unification of the first stage with the second stage is the key-task of the editorial secretary. His tasks are both of a practical and critical evaluative nature. He has the freedom to decide on any necessary extra-steps or extra-measures in order to ensure the best synchronization between the two stages. The editorial secretary is also the main layout editor.

When the draft of the new issue is handed in to the editorial secretary, who is in charge of turning it into the finite work of print, he makes a careful scheduling of re-collecting the improved manuscripts. The editorial secretary makes up the table of contents and, after meetings with the editor-in-chief, decides on the sections of the new issue.

The final decision of the selection or rejection of a manuscript is taken by the editor-in-chief, together with the editorial secretary and the associate editor-in-chief. They carefully analyze the file with the responses of the peer-reviewers. The two peer-reviewers of each manuscript have already expressed their opinions: “pro” or “against” publication (Yes/No on the final question of the peer-review form). The three mentioned executive editors also express an opinion after re-evaluating the manuscript, either “pro” or “against” publication. The majority ( $\geq 3$  of the 5 opinions) wins. The author is informed by one of the reviews editors. If the topic of the manuscript is not covered by ALLRO, the reviews editors inform the author directly without sending the manuscript to the peer-reviewers.

The section editors help the reviews editors for the completion of the first stage. For the second stage, they are assigned new tasks by the editor-in-chief and by the editorial secretary.

#### *About peer-reviewers*

Our journal has a clear policy of selecting the peer-reviewers on the basis of their proven affinities and activities. We are familiar with the books and articles published by our peer-reviewers and with their domains of interest. We have contacted in person all the peer-reviewers of our journal. We have not resorted yet to the practice of peer-reviewers selected on a basis of an application form (but a future expansion of our journal may bring the adoption of this practice).

Who are our peer-reviewers? First of all, intellectuals with an authentic passion for reading and for culture, proven by their activities and achievements. They are our colleagues (peers) from other Romanian universities and from abroad institutes and universities. Or they work in institutions of culture and education or in the cultural press. If the one of the peer-reviewers has excellent competences in Romanian literature and can give valuable comments on the contents of the manuscript but s/he declines to assess the article from the point of view of linguistic corrections, spelling,

focusing mainly on the literary evaluation, then a third peer-reviewer is assigned to that manuscript with a specific task of language corrections. The peer-reviewers may use English, Romanian or the language of the manuscript. They must be fluent in the language of the manuscript they evaluate.

In case of simultaneous unavailability of some of the peer-reviewers, the reviews editors address the editor-in-chief to supplement the list of peer-reviewers.

We rely on the discernment of our peer-reviewers and we are thankful for their confirmed good intentions.