The scientific evaluation procedure (peer-review) of the books proposed for publication at the National Institute for the Study of Totalitarianism (NIST)

The National Institute for the Study of Totalitarianism (NIST) has as its object of activity, in addition to the identification in archives and the study of relevant documents for understanding the evolution of totalitarian regimes, the editing of volumes of studies and documents, memoirs, dictionaries and encyclopedias (working tools) with manifestations and ideologies specific to totalitarianism. The published volumes addresses researchers interested in various aspects related to the profile of totalitarian regimes, from the radiography of institutions to the analysis of everyday life. NIST requests and receives annually from other research institutes or departments within universities lists of proposed titles for publication. The lists are accompanied by a brief description of the content, a summary and an assessment of a possible space for dissemination in the academic world. All papers (books) proposed for publication are subject to the approval of the Scientific Council of NIST. Papers or books received from the author(s)/coordinator(s) is assigned to a working-team consisting of an editor and a technical editor, after which it goes through several stages of preparation. For papers in the first edition, an evaluation system will be used in which the papers are anonymized, and the referents are also anonymous (double security). For works in later editions, an evaluation system of the simple security type is used, with references referring to the previous edition.

The work proposed for evaluation is checked with the anti-plagiarism software, after which a similarity report results, which is sent by the editor to the authors. To the extent that they consider it necessary, they can express a point of view. The anonymized paper and the similarity report resulting from the anti-plagiarism software's check are sent to two referees (chosen by the editor from the list corresponding to the scientific field or from the scientific college of the book collection) together with the anti-plagiarism software's report. The referees will analyze the similarity ratio and the paper itself, taking into account, but not limited to, the evaluation criteria. The argumentation regarding the fulfillment/failure

of the evaluation criteria for the works proposed for publication must be consistent. The evaluation criteria listed are not intended to be exhaustive, the referee having the possibility to add other elements that he considers relevant for the paper under evaluation. The evaluation report is sent to the editor who contacted them from NIST, within no more than 6 weeks. After evaluation, the paper can be considered as: 1. accepted and recommended for publication; 2. accepted with revisions; in this case the referees will send the comments to the editor, who will forward them to the author; the consultation process between the author and the referent is carried out through the book editor until a common point of view is found; if he requested changes, the referent will finally send an addition to the peer-review report (with the same format) showing that the work is accepted following revisions or rejected; 3. rejected.

The evaluation reports will be kept in the file of the work that is archived at the NIST Publishing House. Autobiographical works will not be anonymized for the evaluation procedure (open peer-review), the author's name resulting from the content of the book.

Highlights regarding the didactic and scientific evaluation criteria for the books published at NIST:

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCIENTIFIC PAPERS:

A. STUDIES, SYNTHESES:

1. The relevance of the title of the paper. 2. The relevance/interest of the research topic. 3. The interweaving of theoretical aspects and the empirical validation of the formulated scientific hypotheses. 4. The multidisciplinary character of the scientific investigation. 5. The scientific accuracy of information. 6. Clarity and coherence of expression, logical stringing of ideas. 7. Concordance with the title, coverage of the thematic area. 8. Referenced publications, reference to relevant scientific literature. 9. Value and general scientific level of the work. 10. The importance of the author/authors' own contributions within the work, the quality of the innovative approach.

B. ENCYCLOPEDIAS, DICTIONARY:

1. Relevance of the title of the work 2. Scientific accuracy of the information 3. Clarity and coherence of expression, logical stringing of ideas 4. Methodical exposition of the fundamental notions of the discipline 5. General scientific appearance of the work 6. Dimensions of the work – a synthesis of the fundamental topics of a scientific branch involves larger dimensions, possibly the work being divided into volumes.

C. COLLECTIONS OF DOCUMENTS:

1. Relevance of the title of the paper 2. Scientific accuracy of the information 3. Clarity and coherence of expression, logical stringing of ideas 4. Coverage of the topics announced by the respective collection of documents and compliance with their selection methodology so that the topic should be adequately analyzed.