



# NLUA LAW REVIEW (NLUALR)

ISSN: 2455-8680

## PEER REVIEW POLICY

NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY AND JUDICIAL ACADEMY, ASSAM

The *NLUA Law Review* adheres to a rigorous peer review process designed to ensure scholarly excellence, factual and legal consistency, and adherence to the highest standards of academic writing. Each manuscript considered for publication is reviewed by subject-matter experts with demonstrated expertise in the relevant area of law.

## **1. Review Process**

Submissions are assessed by peer reviewers selected on the basis of their specialisation in the relevant legal domain. The reviewer may recommend one of the following outcomes:

- Acceptance without revisions;
- Acceptance subject to major or minor revisions; or
- Rejection of the manuscript.

The editorial board communicates the peer reviewer's feedback and recommendations to the author. Where appropriate, authors are invited to revise their submissions in line with the reviewer's suggestions. The editors then evaluate whether the author has meaningfully addressed the recommendations. Multiple rounds of revision and review may be undertaken as necessary. If the editors find the revisions inadequate, they retain the discretion to reject the manuscript. A final decision—acceptance or rejection—is conveyed to the author upon completion of this process.

## **2. Nature of the Review System**

The *NLUA Law Review* employs a **double-blind peer review** model. Neither the identity of the author nor that of the peer reviewer is disclosed to the other, in order to preserve impartiality and integrity in the review process.

## **3. Communication and Clarifications**

All communication between the author and the peer reviewer is facilitated solely by the editorial team. If an author seeks clarification on reviewer comments, they may raise the issue with the editors, who will then act as intermediaries to obtain and communicate responses from the reviewer.

#### **4. Number and Selection of Reviewers**

Each manuscript is typically reviewed by one peer reviewer. However, if the initial reviewer recommends further scrutiny or if the editors believe an additional round is warranted, the paper may be referred to other reviewers.

Peer reviewers are selected based on their subject expertise, practical experience, or academic contributions. Only those with a demonstrated background in the relevant legal field, academics, practitioners, or policy experts, are engaged in this role.

#### **5. Conflict of Interest**

Authors are required to disclose the names of any individuals with whom the manuscript has previously been discussed. Such individuals will be excluded from serving as peer reviewers for the submission.

The Journal also ensures that invited peer reviewers have not had prior access to, or engagement with, the submitted manuscript, in keeping with the double-blind policy.

#### **6. Review Criteria**

Peer reviewers are encouraged to assess submissions using the following (non-exhaustive) metrics:

- Identification and framing of legal issues;
- Depth and quality of research;
- Soundness of analysis and interpretation;
- Coherence and clarity of argumentation;
- Novelty and original contribution;
- Relevance to the development of legal jurisprudence;
- Engagement with existing literature;
- Proper referencing and use of up-to-date sources;
- Logical structure and presentation of the paper.

Reviewers may recommend acceptance, conditional acceptance with revisions, or rejection. The editorial board evaluates whether the reviewer's suggestions have been sufficiently implemented before arriving at a final decision.

Authors are expected to engage meaningfully with reviewer feedback and incorporate a substantial portion of the suggested changes. If an author chooses not to implement specific recommendations, they must provide written justification explaining the reasons.

Final discretion regarding whether the revisions meet the necessary standard lies with the editorial team. If the changes are found inadequate, the manuscript may be rejected at this stage.

## **8. Timeline**

The Journal aims to provide initial peer review feedback within **three weeks** from the date the manuscript is sent to the reviewer. However, this timeline may be extended in exceptional circumstances, particularly where further review rounds are involved.

Authors will be kept informed of the progress of the review at regular intervals. Final acceptance or rejection will be communicated only after the editors are satisfied that reviewer comments have been adequately addressed.

## **9. Reviewer Feedback for Rejected Manuscripts**

In the event a reviewer recommends rejection, they are encouraged to provide constructive feedback outlining the reasons for their recommendation and highlighting specific areas of deficiency. This helps ensure transparency and offers authors insight into how their work may be improved for future publication.