

Peer Review Process

The submitted papers are subject of a blinded peer review process, in order to select for publishing the articles meeting the highest possible standards.

In a first step the editor sends the received papers, without the name and affiliation of authors, to two experts in the field, by using the on-line web management system.

The electronic evaluation form used by reviewers contains a checklist in order to help referees to cover all aspects that can decide the publication.

In the final section of the evaluation form, the reviewers must include observations and suggestions for improvement that are send to the authors, without the names of the reviewers. All the reviewers of a paper remain anonymous to the authors and act independently before, during and after the evaluation process. They have different affiliation, are usually located in different towns/countries, and they are not aware of each other's identities. If the decisions of the two reviewers are not the same (accept / reject), the paper is send to a third reviewer.

The final decision for publication is done by the Editor-in-Chief based on the scrutiny of reviewers and the scope of the journal. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for the quality and selection of manuscripts chosen to be published, and the authors are always responsible for the content of each article.

After the reviewing process, authors receive the decision from the editorial board as follows:

- Accepted
- Accepted with slight changes
- Revise and resubmit
- Rejected (not in compliance with the journal)

Checklist

1. Characteristics or compatibility of the paper with the main aims of IJOT
2. Adequate enouncing of the paper's title
3. Relevance of abstract, key words and conformity with the paper's content
4. Paper's structure is well defined and chosen in accordance with the approached theme
5. Scientific quality
6. The paper's novelty level
7. Originality in approaching the paper's issues

8. Clarity, concisely character in presenting the paper's content
9. Sound argumentation of the presented case study
10. Lack of errors, wrong ideas, ambiguities
11. The paper's subject is compatible with the purpose of IJOT
12. The used references illustrate the idea of the text
13. Quotes from international notoriety magazines (ISI Web of knowledge)
14. Quotes from international journals indexed in international data bases
15. Quotes from the previous issues of the International Journal of Orthodox Theology