

COURT OF CONSCIENCE – PEER REVIEW POLICY

To maintain a high-quality publication, Court of Conscience practices an independent, anonymous peer-review process that follows the procedure outlined below.

Initial Manuscript Evaluation

First, manuscripts are evaluated for their suitability to our journal and theme. Manuscripts rejected at this stage either fall outside the scope of the publication or fail to meet our guidelines. Some exceptional or non-academic manuscripts are accepted at this stage.

Double Blind Reviewing

Court of Conscience uses 'double blind reviewing' where both author and referee are anonymised. Referees are matched to manuscripts according to expertise. To ensure integrity, referees are also sourced from institutions that are independent of any affiliation with the contributing author.

Nature of Referee Reports

Given the nature of articles in the Court of Conscience, referees are not asked perform a formal review, but only provide an indication as to

whether the manuscript a) cites the law correctly, and b) is of a publishable standard. Editing the author's expression is not a part of the peer review process, but referees may make suggestions if appropriate.

Final Report

To proceed to the editing stage, a manuscript requires two reports to confirm that the law is correctly cited and that the manuscript is of a publishable standard. Where these two reports contradict each other, a third referee is sought. Some exceptional manuscripts will be accepted on the basis of one authoritative report. A final decision to accept or reject the manuscript will be sent to the author, along with any recommendations. Some manuscripts may require revision before acceptance. The Editorial Team of the Court of Conscience retains ultimate discretion as to publication decisions.