EVALUATION CRITERIAS

The peer-reviewer and the SIAR's Secretariat have responsibility for assessing papers that will be published in the SIAR's magazines „Ingineria automobilului - rIA" and „Romanian Journal of Automotive Engineering - RoJAE".

Are taken into account the following evaluation criterias of articles:

Fundamental technical value

In the article should be addressed the main elements of scientific, technical, economic and/or practical of the problem studied/presented.

1. Is the subject dealt with topical?
2. Is the title appropriate for the content of the article?
3. Is the purpose of the paper well specified?
4. Is the paper clearly written and well organized?
5. Does the work meet the *RoJAE & rIA Template* requirements?

Creativity and innovation

The article should comprise new, innovative and unique aspects.

The author should have included details of previous papers which he published on the same subject.

1. Does the author make original contribution?
2. Does the article comply with the latest state of the art in its specific fiel?

Experimental research/studies theoretical/analytical

Credibility of the results obtained/theoretical elements developed.

1. Is the mathematical support adequate to the theme of the paper?
2. Are mathematical models developed?
3. Are the symbols used well defined?
4. Is the mathematical calculus correct?
5. Are the experimental researches logically and completely described?
6. Are the technical characteristics of the research equipment used sufficiently described?
7. Is correct the processing of experimental research results?

Impact Level

The paper should stimulate discussion among experts in the field and provide a form a long term reference.

1. Do the resuls obtained contribute progress in the field?
2. Are the conclusions justified?
3. Are the references sufficient, relevant and current?
4. Is the Englis language appropriately used?

The articles will be evaluated by reviewers.

A reviewer will assign each article for each of the 4 criteria individually, scores in the range of 0-5, where 0 = unacceptable and 5 = excellent and set assigned the aggregate of the 4 scores as "total score".

Each abstract must be assessed independently by at least two reviewers.

"The final score" of an abstract is given by average total scores of all reviewers.

The final score report, an article may be in one of the following situations:

≤ 18 Final score ≤ 20: Excellent, recommended for publication;

≤ 14 Final score <18: Good, recommended for publication;

≤ 8 Final score <14: Satisfactory, suitable for waiting; It will be published only when needed to complement the content of the magazine; It can be improved and evaluated again;

<8: Unacceptable, recommended restoring article.

An example:

	Reviewer A	**Reviewer B**
C1. Fundamental technical value	5	3
C2. Creativity and Innovation	4	4
C3. Experimental research/studies theoretical/analytical	4	3
C4. Impact Level	3	3
Total score	16	13
Final score	*14,5* - Good, recommended for publication	

Issued by,
Prof. Dr. Eng. Minu Mitrea
General Secretary of SIAR