LexisNexis Peer Review Policy

General Principles

Peer review is essential for maintaining the quality, credibility, and integrity of LexisNexis Journals. It ensures that submissions are critically evaluated by experts before publication, helping to uphold academic standards and improve the overall quality of research. The process also ensures that the research published is relevant and timely, addressing current issues and advancing legal discourse. Through detailed, constructive feedback, reviewers help authors refine their work, improving its clarity, accuracy and depth. This collaboration strengthens legal scholarship, contributing to the development of robust legal theory and practice. Our readers and subscribers can trust that the research in our articles has been thoroughly vetted by knowledgeable experts.

LexisNexis Australia follows the basic principles and standards of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) for ethical peer review.

Models of Peer Review

LexisNexis Australia employs a double-blind peer review model. This ensures that neither the author nor the reviewers know each other's identities, promoting impartiality and objectivity in the review process.

Conducting the Review

Objectivity and Constructiveness

Your review should:

- be objectively based solely on the content of the manuscript, without any personal bias or unfounded criticism.
- Provide feedback that helps authors improve their work.
- Avoid personal, unprofessional, or derogatory comments.
- Evaluate the manuscript for its accuracy, originality, clarity, and relevance to the journal's scope.

Confidentiality

The manuscript you are reviewing is a confidential document. You must not discuss or share it with others unless permitted by the editor, or use information from the manuscript for personal advantage or to benefit others, including your own research.

Conflict of Interest

Inform the editor of any personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest that could bias your review. If you have a close relationship with the author or have competing interests with the topic of the manuscript, you should decline the review.

Acknowledge Limitations

If you feel unqualified to review a manuscript due to its topic, inform the editor and suggest alternative reviewers if possible. If certain parts of the manuscript are unclear or beyond your expertise, ask for clarification rather than making assumptions.

Ethical Concerns

You must report any concerns regarding ethical issues including but not limited to plagiarism, data fabrication, manipulation, or duplicate submission to the editor.

Writing the report

Review report

LexisNexis Australia will provide peer-reviewers with a review template where you will have to first provide a rating of the article using the below categories:

- Originality
- Accuracy
- Currency
- Contribution of new knowledge or insight into area of law
- Development of argument and analysis
- Adequacy of referencing
- Organisation and structure
- Clarity of style and language
- Overall scholarly contribution.

Reviewers are then invited to provide a written review of the article before making a publishing recommendation.

Provide Clear Recommendations

Reviewers should:

- Offer clear and specific comments regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript.

- Suggest ways to improve the manuscript, such as refining methodologies, expanding literature review, or clarifying arguments.
- Recommend whether the manuscript should be accepted, revised, or rejected
- Always provide detailed justification for your recommendation.

Professional Conduct

Use respectful, professional, and neutral language throughout your review. Do not make personal remarks about the authors. The purpose of peer review is to improve the quality of research, so reviewers are encouraged to engage with the process in a collaborative and constructive manner.

Timeliness

Peer review should be completed within the agreed-upon time frame. If you need more time, contact the editor promptly to negotiate a new deadline. If you cannot complete the review due to personal reasons or other constraints, inform the editor immediately to allow alternative arrangements.

Thank you for providing us with your expertise. If you have further questions on this peer-review guideline, please contact Virania Munaf (virania.munaf@lexisnexis.com.au) and/or Catherine Zemann (catherine.zemann@lexisnexis.com.au)