

PEER REVIEW POLICY

Indraprastha Law Review (ILR)

**University School of Law and Legal
Studies,**

**Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha
University**

PEER REVIEW POLICY

Indraprastha Law Review (ILR)

University School of Law and Legal Studies, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University

1. Title and Scope

This policy shall be known as the **Peer Review Policy of the Indraprastha Law Review (ILR), University School of Law and Legal Studies, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University (GGSIPU)**. It shall apply to all scholarly manuscripts submitted for publication in the journal, including research articles, doctrinal and empirical legal studies, case comments, legislative comments and other scholarly contributions falling within the journal's scope. The policy establishes the principles and procedures governing peer review, reviewer selection, editorial decision-making, confidentiality, conflicts of interest, research integrity and communication with authors.

2. Objectives

The peer review process of ILR aims to ensure the academic quality, originality, legal relevance and methodological rigour of manuscripts considered for publication. The journal shall follow a fair, impartial and consistent **double-blind peer review process**, under which the identities of authors and reviewers are not disclosed to each other. Editorial decisions shall be based primarily on the scholarly merit, originality, relevance and quality of the manuscript, while maintaining confidentiality, editorial independence and research integrity.

3. Applicable Standards

The peer review process shall be guided by applicable GGSIPU policies, relevant UGC requirements and recognized national and international principles of publication ethics. The journal shall have due regard to the guidelines of the **Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)** and the *Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing* developed by COPE, DOAJ, OASPA and WAME, as applicable. Adoption of such principles shall not, by itself, constitute a claim of compliance with any particular indexing, accreditation or database requirement unless the requisite eligibility conditions are independently satisfied.

4. Double-Blind Peer Review

ILR shall ordinarily follow a double-blind peer review system. The identities of authors shall not be disclosed to reviewers, and the identities of reviewers shall not be disclosed to authors. The Editorial Office shall take reasonable measures to remove author-identifying information from manuscripts and associated files and shall manage communications between authors and reviewers.

Complete anonymity cannot, however, be guaranteed in every case, particularly where an author's identity may reasonably be inferred from the subject matter, writing style, institutional references, self-citations or publicly available material. Reviewers shall not

deliberately seek to identify authors and shall promptly inform the Editorial Office if knowledge of an author's identity creates or appears to create a conflict of interest or affects impartiality.

Editorial decisions shall remain independent of the author's institutional affiliation, designation, nationality, gender, religion, political views or other irrelevant personal characteristics.

5. Editorial Responsibilities

The Editor-in-Chief shall oversee the implementation of this policy and ensure that manuscripts are appropriately screened, assigned to competent reviewers and considered fairly and confidentially. The Editorial Board and Associate Editors shall assist in assessing the suitability of manuscripts, identifying appropriate reviewers, evaluating review reports and addressing potential conflicts of interest or ethical concerns.

The Editorial Office shall maintain appropriate records relating to submissions, reviewer assignments, review reports, editorial decisions and relevant communications. Reasonable safeguards shall be adopted to protect the confidentiality of manuscripts and the identities of authors and reviewers.

6. Preliminary Editorial Screening

All submissions shall undergo preliminary editorial screening to determine their conformity with the journal's aims and scope, submission requirements and formatting guidelines. The Editorial Office may also assess the completeness, originality, legal relevance and academic suitability of the manuscript and conduct an initial similarity or plagiarism check.

A manuscript may be sent for external peer review, returned for technical correction or declined at the preliminary stage where it falls outside the journal's scope, fails essential submission requirements or does not meet the minimum editorial standards. A preliminary editorial decision shall not be represented as a peer review decision where no external peer review has been undertaken.

Similarity reports shall be assessed in context. A similarity percentage alone shall not automatically constitute plagiarism or determine acceptance or rejection; relevant quotations, citations, legislation, standard legal terminology and other legitimate sources shall also be considered.

7. Selection of Peer Reviewers

Reviewers shall be selected on the basis of their relevant subject expertise, academic or professional experience, ability to provide an objective and constructive assessment, availability and absence of any conflict of interest. The journal shall ordinarily appoint independent reviewers who are not members of the authorship team and who possess appropriate expertise in the subject or methodology of the manuscript.

A reviewer shall disclose any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest, including recent collaboration, supervisory or close professional relationships, institutional

conflicts, personal or academic rivalry, financial interests or any other circumstance that may affect impartiality. The journal may consider reviewer suggestions made by authors, where permitted, but such suggestions shall not be binding upon the Editorial Board.

8. Peer Review Procedure

The peer review process shall ordinarily comprise submission and preliminary screening, anonymisation of the manuscript, appointment of suitable independent reviewers, double-blind evaluation, editorial assessment and communication of the decision to the author. Each manuscript selected for external review shall ordinarily be evaluated by **at least two independent peer reviewers**.

Where the reviewers provide substantially conflicting recommendations, one report is inadequate, the manuscript involves specialised or interdisciplinary issues, or an additional assessment is otherwise considered necessary, the Editor may seek an additional independent review. The editor shall consider the substantive reasoning contained in the reviewers' reports and shall retain responsibility for the final editorial decision.

A revised manuscript may be returned to the original reviewers or assigned to other suitable reviewers, depending upon the nature and extent of the revisions.

9. Reviewer Evaluation

Reviewers shall assess manuscripts with reference to originality, clarity and significance of the research question, quality and depth of legal analysis, engagement with relevant literature, appropriateness of methodology, coherence of argumentation, accuracy and use of legal authorities, quality of empirical research where applicable, validity of conclusions, and overall presentation and compliance with journal requirements.

Reviewers may recommend **acceptance, minor revision, major revision or rejection**. Such recommendations shall be advisory, and the final decision shall rest with the Editorial Office in accordance with the journal's established standards and procedures.

10. Confidentiality and Reviewer Responsibilities

Confidentiality of Journal Information and Restrictions on Disclosure

Reviewers shall maintain strict confidentiality regarding all manuscripts, review materials, editorial communications, reviewer assignments, editorial deliberations, decisions and other non-public information obtained in connection with the peer review process of the *Indraprastha Law Review (ILR)*. Reviewers shall not disclose, circulate, reproduce, discuss or otherwise share any such information on social media platforms, professional networking websites, blogs, online forums, messaging platforms or any other public or private digital platform without prior written authorisation from the Editorial Office. Reviewers shall not post or make public any information concerning manuscripts under review, the identity of authors or other reviewers, editorial decisions, review reports or internal journal communications. These obligations shall

continue to apply after completion of the review process or termination of the reviewer's association with the journal. Any breach of confidentiality may result in removal from the journal's reviewer panel and such further action as may be considered appropriate by the Editorial Board.

Confidentiality of Similarity Reports

The Editorial team may conduct a similarity check of submitted manuscripts as part of the preliminary editorial screening process. Similarity reports generated through plagiarism-detection or similarity-checking software shall remain confidential and shall be used internally by the Editorial Office for assessing the originality and academic integrity of submissions. **Similarity reports shall not be shared with authors.** Where a concern regarding textual similarity, inadequate attribution or potential plagiarism arises, the Editorial team may communicate the relevant concern to the author and seek clarification, correction or other appropriate action without disclosing the similarity report itself. Editorial decisions shall be based on a contextual assessment of the manuscript and the relevant circumstances, and not solely on a numerical similarity percentage.

11. Editorial Decision-Making

Editorial decisions shall be based on the scholarly quality and relevance of the manuscript, the substantive assessment of reviewers, compliance with journal requirements and any relevant ethical or research-integrity concerns. The possible outcomes may include acceptance, acceptance subject to minor revisions, revision and resubmission following major revisions, or rejection.

Where reviewer recommendations differ, the responsible editor shall assess the reasons provided in the reports and may seek clarification or an additional review where necessary. The existence of differing recommendations shall not, by itself, determine the editorial outcome.

12. Conflict of Interest

All persons involved in the editorial and peer review process shall disclose any circumstance that may compromise, or reasonably appear to compromise, their impartiality. Particular attention shall be given to close personal or professional relationships, recent collaboration or supervision, financial or institutional interests and substantial academic rivalry.

Where an Editor-in-Chief, Editorial Board member or editor submits a manuscript to ILR, appropriate safeguards shall be adopted, including assignment of the manuscript to an independent editor and external reviewers.

13. Responsibilities of Authors

Authors shall ensure that submitted manuscripts constitute original work and are not simultaneously under consideration elsewhere unless expressly permitted. Authors shall accurately present their research and analysis, appropriately acknowledge

sources and legal authorities, and honestly report empirical findings. Required ethical approvals, permissions and consents shall be obtained where applicable.

All listed authors shall have made an appropriate contribution to the manuscript and shall consent to its submission. Authors shall provide an anonymised manuscript for double-blind review and shall respond professionally to reviewer comments and provide appropriate explanations for revisions.

14. Revision and Resubmission

Where revisions are required, authors shall submit a revised manuscript within the period specified by the Editorial Office and, where required, a response addressing the reviewers' comments. A revised manuscript may undergo further review, and submission of a revised version shall not automatically imply acceptance.

15. Publication Ethics and Research Integrity

ILR shall not tolerate plagiarism, duplicate or redundant publication, fabrication or falsification of data, citation manipulation, undisclosed conflicts of interest, authorship disputes, peer review manipulation, breach of confidentiality or misrepresentation of legal or empirical authorities. Where a credible concern is raised, the Editorial Office shall examine the matter and take appropriate action in accordance with applicable ethical standards and institutional requirements.

16. Appeals and Complaints

An author may submit an appeal where there is a significant procedural irregularity, material factual error, unresolved conflict of interest or substantial inconsistency with the journal's established policy. Appeals shall state specific grounds and supporting reasons and shall be considered by the Editor-in-Chief or an appropriately designated independent editor. Complaints relating to editorial conduct, peer review, conflicts of interest or publication ethics shall be submitted through the journal's official communication channel.

17. Review Timelines

The journal may prescribe indicative timelines for preliminary screening, reviewer appointment, peer review, editorial decision-making and review of revised manuscripts. Such timelines shall be treated as operational targets and shall be published only where they are realistic and capable of being monitored.

18. Transparency and Disclosure

The journal shall make its peer review policy publicly available through its official website or other appropriate platform. The published information shall include the journal's double-blind review model, general review procedure, editorial decision-making framework, confidentiality and conflict-of-interest requirements, publication ethics procedures, appeal and complaint mechanisms, and any relevant exceptions to the standard review process. The publicly available policy shall also specify that reviewers are prohibited from disclosing confidential journal-related information on social media or other platforms and that similarity reports generated during editorial screening shall not be shared with authors.

19. Periodic Review of the Policy

This policy shall be reviewed periodically by the Editorial Board or other designated authority to ensure its continued consistency with applicable GGSIPU requirements, relevant UGC regulations, recognized publication ethics principles and developments in peer review practices. Any amendment requiring approval shall be placed before the competent authority in accordance with applicable institutional procedures.

References

The policy may be read with the relevant guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), the *Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing* developed by COPE, DOAJ, OASPA and WAME, applicable UGC requirements, and relevant GGSIPU policies.