

Manuscript Submission and Peer Review Process

Manuscript Acquisition Process

The process of attracting manuscript proposals for Corint Publishing House's history collections places collection coordinators at its core. As prominent figures in the academic and scientific community, they maintain strong connections within university and research environments and directly approach both emerging historians interested in publishing with a major publishing house and established authors, who are particularly interested in having their works printed in significant print runs.

In addition to the collection coordinators, an important role is played by the editorial director, editors, preface writers, and translators — in general, all collaborators involved in the editorial process — who may also reach out to authors in the field of history. At the same time, authors interested in publishing with Corint may contact us directly via email at office@edituracorint.ro, secretariat@edituracorint.ro, or redactia@edituracorint.ro, where they can submit the electronic file of their manuscript.

Editorial proposals are immediately taken over by the editorial director who, together with the general director and the collection coordinators, evaluates the opportunity for publication based on the following principles: relevance to the field, originality of the work, compliance with scientific standards, level of interest for the general public, and the work's commercial potential. If a manuscript meets all criteria except public appeal, the publishing house may seek funding solutions from cultural or scientific institutions.

Following this initial assessment, the manuscript is sent for evaluation to one of the publisher's reviewers, selected based on their expertise in the subject matter. The reviewer may recommend acceptance as submitted, acceptance with revisions, or rejection.

After this stage is completed, the author is informed of the decision. If accepted, the manuscript is sent electronically to an editor and, after the editing phase, to a layout specialist for typesetting. In parallel, the publisher and the author sign a copyright transfer agreement. The print run is determined based on the author's reputation, public interest in the topic (assessed through sales of similar titles), and the novelty of the work compared to similar publications.

Peer Review Process

To ensure that submitted manuscripts meet fundamental scientific standards, the publishing house relies on a panel of reviewers — recognized experts in the field of history, with visibility, experience, and authority in their areas of research. From this group of ten reviewers, one is selected whose expertise most closely matches the subject of the proposed manuscript.

The reviewer receives the manuscript in its original electronic format. If the conclusions of the review are not sufficiently clear, the publisher may request a second evaluation. As a rule, the reviewer and the author must not belong to the same institution or academic center.

If the submitted work is a doctoral thesis, the author may also provide the reports from the doctoral committee, which can serve as evaluation references. However, the publisher reserves the right to conduct its own independent review.

Reviewers assess the manuscript according to clearly defined criteria. The work must demonstrate originality, scientific value, relevance, and impact within the field. It must be clearly and coherently written, logically structured, and well argued, with a relevant and up-to-date topic. Methodological innovation or the use of modern methodologies represents an additional advantage. Reviewers are expected to read the manuscript in full, demonstrate objectivity, provide constructive criticism, and show respect for both the author and the work.

Reviewers prepare a detailed evaluation report of several pages, demonstrating thorough analysis of the manuscript, and complete an evaluation form (provided by the editorial office) containing specific criteria.

The evaluation form addresses the following aspects:

- Relevance to the field
- Quality of the scientific content
- Degree of originality and novelty
- Relevance and impact on the field
- Methodology used
- Up-to-date bibliography
- Rigor of documentation and clarity of scientific argumentation

Reviewers may recommend one of three outcomes:

1. Acceptance for publication (with only minor revisions to improve style or align with editorial standards);
2. Acceptance with revisions (the work has scientific merit but requires improvements, such as further development of arguments);
3. Rejection (if the work fails to meet one or more mandatory criteria).

Reviewers are encouraged to include additional recommendations of any kind. The evaluation report and form are submitted to the editorial office by email or in print and are archived by the publisher.

Responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the reviewers' requested revisions lies with the editor assigned to the book. Reviewers are typically given between one and two weeks to complete their evaluation, depending on the length and complexity of the manuscript.