

REVIEW POLICY



NLIU LAW REVIEW

2025-26

PREFACE

About NLIU Law Review

The NLIU Law Review is the flagship journal of the National Law Institute University, Bhopal, published bi-annually by the students of the University. It is a double blind peer-reviewed academic law journal which aims to inculcate a culture of academic research and writing among students, and serve as an important forum for discourse on contemporary and pressing legal issues. The NLIU Law Review does not restrict itself to any particular area of law and welcomes contributions from all fields of law. As of the year 2025, the NLIU Law Review has completed fifteen successful years, with fifteen editions in publication. The NLIU Law Review engages students throughout the publication process, such that a majority of the editing, managerial and organizational work is undertaken by the student body of the journal. Given the opportunities it provides to the student community, the journal has a direct bearing on the academic research-oriented goals that the institution envisages to meet.

NLIU Law Review Primer on Editing Legal Manuscripts and our Review Policy

Academic research and writing skills are indispensable for any person in the legal profession. Apart from these skills, it is also quintessential for every law student and member of the legal fraternity to know the basics of reviewing and editing legal manuscripts. As there does not exist extensive publicly available guiding literature on this subject, the editors at the NLIU Law Review, past and present, decided to utilise their experience with the journal over the years in order to formulate a primer on the editing of legal manuscripts. **The present primer shall also be considered as our Review Policy.** This primer briefly covers a number of aspects pertaining to review of legal research papers, ranging from the categories and segments of manuscripts to technical and content review. By way of this primer, the NLIU Law Review generally seeks to further its objective of encouraging legal research and writing of the utmost quality among law students, professionals, practitioners, and academicians. This primer also gives a deep insight into how the editors at this journal review and shortlist legal manuscripts for publication.

The Review Policy of the NLIU Law Review ensures that all manuscripts submitted are subjected to a fair, rigorous, and structured evaluation. The process is designed to maintain high academic and ethical standards in legal scholarship and to promote original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

As part of our commitment to impartiality and fairness, NLIU Law Review follows a double-blind peer review system, where neither the author(s) nor the reviewer(s) are made aware of each other's identity.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF EDITORIAL REVIEW

Before delving into the specific guidelines to be followed during the review of manuscripts, there are a few ‘common sense’ principles of editing which need to be reaffirmed:

- i. The primary role of a reviewer is to judge the quality of the content in the manuscript, with the aim of ascertaining whether or not it merits publication. This requires the editor to be value-neutral to a large extent; they may disagree with the opinion of the author, but that alone is insufficient to deem the manuscript unworthy of publication.
- ii. Aside from the aforementioned primary role, the reviewer is also required to provide constructive criticism for the authors, regardless of whether the manuscript is deemed acceptable for eventual publication.
- iii. Reviewers should treat the manuscripts they review as they would like their own to be treated. This requires the reviewer to treat each manuscript respectfully, with criticisms being pointed out politely and not in a scathing, demeaning or sardonic manner.

iv. Manuscripts should be judged on their merit, and not on the credentials of their author(s). It goes without saying that editors must not venture out to breach anonymity by finding out the identity of the author of the manuscript.

CATEGORIES OF SUBMISSIONS ACCEPTED

a. Articles

These are comprehensive legal research papers that address a particular topic, question of law, or a legal grey area. Authors may adopt either a neutral, analytical stance, examining multiple perspectives on the topic, or a more argumentative stance advocating for a particular position while thoroughly engaging with counter-arguments.

The word limit accepted for an Article is 4000-10,000 words.

Key expectations for Articles:

- *Comprehensiveness*: All aspects of the topic should be explored in depth, and must be logically bound together with the help of a chain of thought or central argument.
- *Analytical Rigor*: Arguments must be logical, supported by legal reasoning, and critically engage with relevant and already existing literature or precedent.
- *Research Quality*: References should be authoritative, including primary sources (statutes, case law) and secondary sources (scholarly articles, books).

- *Structure:* Clear abstract, introduction, objective, methodology or analytical framework, discussion, and conclusion must be present.

Articles are intended to contribute original insights to legal discourse and must address contemporary legal or socio-legal issues.

b. Case Notes

A Case Note is an extended commentary on a specific judicial decision. Unlike a simple case summary, a case note is an interpretative essay that not only describes the facts and reasoning of the case but also analyses its broader implications.

The word limit accepted for a Case Note is 2000-5000 words.

Key expectations for Case Notes:

- *Comprehensive Description:* Brief background of the case, parties, facts, issues, procedural history, and judgment (with ratio decidendi and obiter dicta) must be present in the Case Note.
- *Critical Analysis:* The reasoning, legal principles applied, and the implications of the decision must be examined.
- *Socio-Political Context:* The wider impact of the case on society, policy, or legal practice must be discussed.
- *Referencing:* Page or paragraph numbers in judgments should be cited wherever applicable to ensure precise attribution.

Case Notes aim to provide readers with both clarity on the case itself and insight into its broader legal significance.

c. Legislative Comments

Legislative Comments analyse statutes, bills, or other law-making instruments in a manner similar to case notes but focus on legislative texts rather than judicial decisions.

The word limit accepted for a Legislative Comment is 1000-3000 words.

Key expectations for Legislative Comments:

- *Concise Description:* Relevant provisions of the statute or instrument must be described.
- *Critical Analysis:* The legal framework, objectives, and operationalization of the law must be discussed. The author must also engage with the previous state of the law, changes made thereto etc, in the case of existing laws on the same subject matter.
- *Socio-Political Context:* The causes behind framing such a law, implications, and potential effects on society or governance must be examined from a critical lens. Comparative perspectives with parallel jurisdictions, as well as broader constitutional questions being addressed are appreciated.
- *Analytical Depth:* The strengths, weaknesses, and interpretative challenges of the legal instrument must be addressed. Specific suggestions based on re-drafting of the law, amendments, repeal, etc. are significantly appreciated.

Legislative Comments aim to bridge legal analysis with socio-political evaluation, highlighting the importance of law-making processes and legislative intent.

d. Book Reviews

A Book Review provides a critical assessment of a legal publication in the context of existing literature and legal standards.

The word limit accepted for a Book Review is 1000-3000 words.

Key expectations for Book Reviews:

- **Summary of Author's Objectives:** The author must explain what the original author aims to accomplish, and also explain or critique the contribution of the author to the given subject matter or area of law.
- **Structural Overview:** The author must describe the key segments, arguments, or chapters of the book.
- **Critical Evaluation:** The quality, relevance, and persuasiveness of the work must be assessed. The evaluation of depth of analysis and author's engagement with prior literature must also be conducted.
- **Evidence-Based Analysis:** The evaluations made by the author must be supported by using examples from the text and, where appropriate, references to other scholarly research.
- **Contextualization:** It is appreciated if the author can situate the book within broader legal scholarship and socio-legal standards.

Book Reviews allow readers to understand the value, contribution, and limitations of the work in a broader legal or social context.

GENERAL NOTE: Each submission, regardless of category, is evaluated for originality, analytical rigor, clarity, research quality, and adherence to ethical standards. All word limits provided above are exclusive of footnotes and abstract.

SEGMENTS OF A MANUSCRIPT

Although the required structure of legal manuscripts varies from journal to journal, manuscripts commonly comprise an abstract, an introductory segment, the main body of the paper, which contains a majority of the discussion on the subject matter and, lastly, a concluding segment, with or without novel suggestions of the author.

Abstract

The abstract is a brief summary of the manuscript that helps the reader quickly ascertain the purpose of the legal paper. An academic abstract outlines four elements relevant to the work – the research focus (that is, the statement of the problem or research issues addressed), research methods used and structure (statutory analysis, case law, doctrinal research), the results of the research, and the conclusions and/or recommendations. A good abstract is one which can stand alone from the manuscript and be understood without reading the manuscript.

In general, the reviewer should ask - if I could not read the entire manuscript, would the abstract adequately summarize it? The editor must also ascertain whether the manuscript and the abstract are contradictory to one another in any manner.

Introduction

The introduction, on the other hand, serves as a problem statement that attracts the attention of the readers to the topic. It serves to explain the rationale for the manuscript and its objects. Usually, this is done by providing context for the study to be undertaken, or by stating that a problem exists and prior scholarly literature does not adequately address this problem. Introductions should also ideally lay out the structure of the manuscript towards the end of the segment (for example, by dividing the paper into parts) and present the hypothesis if any. However, unlike an abstract, the introduction need not present the conclusions of the authors.

Conclusion

The conclusion of any manuscript usually does not have as well defined a list of requirements as an abstract or introduction. However, it is not meant to comprise aimless paragraphs of rhetoric aimed at driving home a point, or merely act as a recapitulation verbatim of all the points in the form of a precis

.
A frequent error authors make is where they belatedly introduce a new concept in the conclusion as an afterthought or suggest recommendations to the problem addressed without sufficient reasoning. If the concluding segment is to deal with suggestions, the same must be analysed with a similar level of depth as the rest of the paper. The editor must use their discretion and adjudge each conclusion on a case-to-case basis to ensure that it is not abrupt, inconsistent with the previous segments, or otherwise inappropriate for the tone of the article.

Tables, Images and Graphical Components

Although not a common occurrence, there have been occasions where a manuscript incorporates tables, images or graphical components. Tables, images and other graphics must have analytical content or be integral to the argument, and not merely be there for aesthetic or supplementary purposes. If the author has used an image from an external source, the same must have a caption and the caption must be footnoted with a reference to the source.

If an image that does not appear to be hand-drawn/computer-drawn by the author is not referenced, it must be removed, or the author must be asked to reference it (in the event the manuscript is otherwise fit for publication). Additionally, the incorporated tables, images, or graphical components shall only be attached as annexure towards the end of the manuscript and no derivation shall be permitted unless the same affects the essence and purpose of such inclusion.

REVIEW PROCESS

The review process consists of five key stages:

- Preliminary Check
- Technical Review
- Content Review
- Peer Review (Double-Blind)
- Pre-Publication Review

Each stage is described in detail below:

a. Preliminary Check

A manuscript is preliminarily rejected when it exhibits fundamental non-compliance with NLIU Law Review's Submission Guidelines or demonstrates a lack of substantive legal engagement. This measure ensures that the time and effort of the Technical, Editorial and Peer Review teams are directed only toward manuscripts that meet the minimum academic and procedural standards.

The principal grounds for preliminary rejection includes:

1) *Non-Compliance with Word Limit*: Each category of submission carries a defined word limit, as mentioned in the ‘*Categories of Submissions Accepted*’ section. Manuscripts that significantly exceed or fall short of these limits may be preliminarily rejected.

However, in recognition of the diversity of submissions, minor deviations are tolerated.

Upper Deviation: Manuscripts exceeding the prescribed upper word limit by less than 10% shall be accepted.

- Articles: up to 11,000 words
- Case Notes: up to 5,500 words
- Legislative Comments and Book Reviews: up to 3,300 words

Lower Deviation: Manuscripts falling short of the lower limit by less than 2.5% shall be accepted.

- Articles: up to 3,900 words
- Case Notes: up to 1,950 words
- Legislative Comments and Book Reviews: up to 975 words

Manuscripts outside these margins shall be rejected at this stage.

2) *Absence of a Legal Question or Analysis*: Submissions must be grounded in legal reasoning or jurisprudential inquiry. Manuscripts that address purely social, economic, environmental, or political themes without engaging with any question of law, legal framework, or interpretative issue shall be rejected.

For instance, a paper discussing an environmental issue without examining statutory or judicial dimensions of environmental law would not qualify for consideration.

3) *Submission of Academic Projects*: Manuscripts that are clearly identifiable as academic projects or coursework submissions, typically characterised by the inclusion of hypotheses, methodology sections, literature reviews, or excessive formatting resembling academic assignments shall be rejected. The NLIU Law Review accepts only original scholarly submissions that align with the standards of academic publishing, not academic coursework.

While these standards are applied consistently, the Editorial Board may exercise limited discretion in cases involving submissions from reputed academicians or professionals, where minor procedural deviations may be excused in view of the manuscript's substantive merit.

b. Technical Review

The Technical Review is the initial stage of the editorial process conducted after preliminary screening and before the content and peer review stages. Its purpose is to ensure that each submission meets the NLIU Law Review's basic academic, ethical, and technical standards before being advanced for substantive evaluation.

The editor assesses the originality of the manuscript vis-à-vis existing scholarly literature, and thereby identifies the instances of plagiarism, if any, in the manuscript. If the manuscript does not meet the minimum threshold requirement for originality, that varies from journal to journal, the manuscript is not deemed worthy of publication.

Types of Plagiarism:

Editors examine the following types of plagiarism in a manuscript, to decide whether a manuscript is passed forward from the Technical Review stages or not.

i. Direct plagiarism-

Direct plagiarism occurs when the author replicates an existing work verbatim or word-for-word without giving due credit to or citing the original author of the work. Failure of the author to give proper citation to the original author or place such borrowed work within quotations is to be considered direct plagiarism. A single instance of direct plagiarism can include a part of a sentence, a sentence, a paragraph or even an entire section of the manuscript. When the author borrows a larger section from another work and gives credit to the original author for some part of it but fails to do it for the rest, the entirety of the section would be considered to be plagiarized under this form of plagiarism.

ii. Paraphrasing-

One of the most common types of plagiarism is paraphrasing. This form of plagiarism occurs when someone else's work is reproduced not verbatim but in essence, without giving due credit to the original work. It involves the author tweaking the sentence structure or substituting the words therein while keeping the underlying information or assertion of the original author intact. Paraphrasing is identified by the editor by taking note of the sentence formation, delivery of idea, style of presenting the argument, etc. Even though the words may be of the author, the plagiarism of ideas without proper referencing still qualifies as plagiarism.

iii. Accidental Plagiarism-

Accidental plagiarism occurs when the author fails to cite the source of their work without the intention to do so. This is also the case when the author cites an incorrect source, understands the work of the original author incorrectly or cites the right work but refers to a part of the work that does not correlate with the assertion supported by such citation. This also happens when the author unintentionally reproduces phrases or sentences that are generic in nature. Despite the absence of an intent to plagiarise, too many instances of accidental plagiarism would lead to disqualification of the manuscript and would not absolve the author from plagiarism.

iv. Secondary Plagiarism-

This is another form of plagiarism which occurs frequently in the submissions of the authors. Secondary plagiarism occurs when the author refers to a source for an assertion but that source refers to another author's work. This leads to the student citing the secondary source exclusively while failing to give due credit to the primary source of their work.

To explain more clearly, if the student refers to book ABC for a particular sentence, while Book ABC cites Book XYZ, then the student is required to cite not only Book XYZ but book ABC as well. The failure to do so would be considered as secondary plagiarism.

v. Self-Plagiarism-

This form of plagiarism occurs in cases where the author resubmits a work authored by them that has already been published elsewhere or reproduces sections of their previously published work. In the latter case, irrespective of the fact that the work the author fails to cite is their own previously published work, providing a citation for the same is highly encouraged.

vi. Reordering Clauses or Idea Paraphrasing-

This occurs when an author rephrases or reorganises another scholar's argument, structure, or reasoning without proper citation. While the language may appear altered, the core intellectual content remains identical to the source. Merely breaking down or reordering clauses, or paraphrasing another's idea using synonyms, does not amount to original authorship.

vii. Patch-working-

Patch-working refers to the act of combining excerpts or ideas from multiple sources and presenting them as an integrated argument without adequate transformation or independent reasoning. Even when minor transitions or linking sentences are added, the resulting work remains derivative if it does not involve genuine synthesis or critique. This type of plagiarism undermines intellectual originality because it reflects compilation rather than analysis.

Therefore, the author must avoid piecing together fragments from existing literature without contributing a distinct or coherent perspective of their own.

viii. Translation Plagiarism-

Translation plagiarism arises when an author reproduces material from a source written in another language, translates it into English and presents it as their own work without proper citation. Even though the words are technically different due to translation, the underlying ideas, argumentation, and expression belong to the original author.

NOTE: All of the above would be considered as instances of plagiarism in the manuscript by an editor, and given due weightage as per the discretion of the author. Therefore, an author should make their best efforts to ensure no part of their work that is not original but taken from a pre-existing piece of scholarly literature fails to give due credit to its source work and thereby ends up qualifying as an instance of plagiarism.

Calculation of Plagiarism Percentage:

For assessment purposes, the plagiarism percentage is calculated using the standard formula:

$$\text{Plagiarism Percentage} = \frac{\text{Number of Plagiarised Words}}{\text{Total Word Count of Manuscript}} \times 100$$

This calculation provides a quantitative reference point to assist editors during the technical review. However, the NLIU Law Review does not rely solely on numerical similarity scores to determine plagiarism.

Each Turnitin report generated for a manuscript is made available to the concerned editors, who conduct a manual evaluation of the flagged content. Editors distinguish between legitimate overlaps (such as citations, commonly used legal phrases, or procedural descriptions) and substantive plagiarism that affects the originality or analytical integrity of the manuscript.

Criteria for Rejection basis Plagiarism:

The NLIU Law Review does not rely on any fixed percentage of similarity as a ground for rejecting a manuscript. Instead, plagiarism is assessed qualitatively, based on whether it affects the essence of the author's academic contribution.

Even if the overall similarity index appears numerically low, the manuscript shall be rejected if plagiarism is detected in core sections that demonstrate the author's independent reasoning or analytical originality.

Plagiarism that undermines the essence of the manuscript is assessed through three primary parameters: Problem Identification, Analysis, and Conclusion.

i. Problem Identification-

The strength of an academic manuscript lies in the author's ability to identify and articulate a distinct legal issue or question of law. This component demonstrates the originality of thought and intellectual engagement with existing scholarship. If the framing of the research problem or central question is directly replicated from another author's work, or merely rephrased without genuine reinterpretation or contextualisation, the manuscript fails to meet the standard of originality. Such replication suggests a lack of independent contribution and may, therefore, constitute a ground for rejection.

However, sometimes the problem identified by the author may be the same as the problem identified in other legal works, nonetheless, the author must have added another dimension to it which must be both unique and contemporary, or the author should present a novel analysis to the problem posed – as discussed in the next heading.

ii. Analysis-

The analytical portion of the manuscript reflects the author's critical engagement with legal sources, precedents, and scholarship. Plagiarism in this section, especially where the author has closely paraphrased the reasoning, argumentation structure, or interpretative method of another scholar without proper attribution is considered serious misconduct.

Even where citations are provided, reproduction of another author's analytical framework, without genuine reinterpretation or critique constitutes plagiarism in substance. A manuscript whose method or manner of analysis is substantially borrowed from pre-existing literature shall be rejected.

iii. Conclusion and Suggestions-

The conclusion is expected to synthesise the author's arguments and offer original insights, solutions, or policy recommendations. Plagiarism in this section whether in summarizing findings, framing implications, or suggesting reforms directly negates the author's contribution to academic discourse.

If the conclusion or recommendations are found to be substantially plagiarized, the manuscript shall be immediately and directly rejected, irrespective of the overall similarity percentage. The originality of conclusions is treated as the most critical determinant of the paper's scholarly integrity.

c. Content Review

Manuscripts passing the Technical Review proceed to Content Review, which evaluates the content of the manuscript for its scholarly merit, analytical rigor, and contemporary relevance. The process of Content Review is two-staged, and after getting accepted at Stage II of the Content Review, proceed for Peer Review.

i. Research Prior to Content Review

Before formally commencing with the content review of any manuscript, it is recommended that editors devote time to do some basic reading on the topic the manuscript deals with. This does not have to be very in-depth, but just sufficient for the editor to have a general idea of the topic. Pre-review research ensures that the editor has familiarised themselves with topics they may not be well aware of or up to date with. It also ensures that the editors are informed of the existing literature on the subject, which becomes relevant in judging the manuscript's contribution to existing literature. Additionally, the reviewer can sometimes spot instances of plagiarism that may have gone unnoticed.

ii. Parameters for the Evaluation

Every manuscript is assessed on the grounds of the substantial discussion or the content therein. This assessment is generally made on criteria including the grammar or language used by the author, the strength of their assertions, the quality of research on the subject matter and so on. A feedback form with the editors' evaluation and remarks on the said criteria is also supplied to the author.

The description of each criteria is given below:

a. Grammar/ Language

This parameter is fairly self-explanatory. However, it is not limited to errors in grammar and punctuation. It extends to erroneous syntax and quality of language used. The style of writing must be academic, and the language used must be reflective of the same. Furthermore, emphasis must be given to the structuring of sentences. For example, even if a sentence is not grammatically incorrect, it may be superfluous, irrelevant or overly complex. Vocabulary and contextual writing may also be taken into consideration. The language can neither be too simplistic nor too complicated and redundant.

Direct statements are preferred to indirect ones and active voice is preferred to passive voice. This is because longer sentences can become especially verbose when worded in the passive voice. Certain other pointers that authors must keep in mind are:

- Contractions must be avoided (for example, ‘does not’ instead of ‘don’t’).
- Bombastic language, generalizations and irrelevant rhetoric are undesirable in a manuscript.
- Capitalisation should be uniform throughout the article.
- If abbreviations are used, they must be announced at the beginning. The abbreviation used must also be consistent throughout the manuscript. Eg: Paragraph 1 states: [...] The Charter of the United Nations [“UN Charter”] [...].

- Paragraph 2 must use the term UN Charter and not UNC or Charter. However, common noun substitutes may continue to be used interchangeably. E.g.: ‘the treaty specifies in article 2(4).’

b. Structure/ Logical Coherence:

While reading the manuscript, the editor looks out for a coherent and sequential form of presentation in an argument.

First, on a macro level, the editor looks out for whether the manuscript has laid out a structure at the beginning, and followed it till the end. Usually, the introductory segment divides the manuscript into its various parts. These should be logically consistent.

Second, on a micro-level, the contentions and arguments of the author should make logical as well as legal sense. If the logical or legal reasoning employed is incomplete, far-fetched, or entirely fallacious, this parameter should be strictly evaluated.

While there may be some exceptions, for the sake of simplicity, it can be said that manuscripts generally attempt to answer a question of law, or a grey area, or assess a hypothesis. This may be addressed by employing any combination of the following devices – statements about previous and existing laws, statements about important historical and factual developments, the tracing of the evolution of jurisprudence, an inter-jurisdictional comparison between legal systems, statistical analysis of social facts, etc. Thus, to assess this parameter the editor verifies whether the author’s use of such combinations is logical, clear and leads to a reasonable conclusion.

c. Contribution to Existing Literature:

This parameter is especially important because the very nature of legal-academic writing is that it must contain more than just a restatement of existing law, facts, and analyses. The manuscript must thus add to the corpus of knowledge that already exists on a particular topic.

For example, when a manuscript engages in a comparative analysis or discusses two concepts together, there should be a significant analysis of the interplay between the two concepts, or the similarities and differences, the pros and cons, etc., and not just a reiteration of the two positions followed by a cursory note on their relationship.

That said, this parameter should not be interpreted as requiring the author to necessarily present hitherto unknown arguments or conclusions. The editor may take into consideration aspects such as whether the author is presenting a non-traditional argument or addressing the same argument from a different point of view. The originality of the approach can satisfy this parameter even if the subject or idea is not wholly original. In essence, while the topic may not be unique, the way it is dealt with must necessarily contribute to pre-existing literature.

This parameter is one of the major factors considered while accepting/rejecting a manuscript. It may be so that all other factors satisfy the editor, but the manuscript does not contribute to the existing literature. In that case, the manuscript can be rejected solely on that ground.

d. Contemporary Relevance:

The parameter of contemporary relevance requires the author to illustrate that the manuscript addresses an issue which has been relevant in the recent past, or addresses a legal grey area relevant in light of recent affairs. This criterion is both objective (was this matter relevant over the past year or extensively discussed?) as well as subjective (how is this legal grey area relevant in light of current affairs or recent judicial pronouncements?).

Like Contribution to Existing Literature, this can also become a sole factor for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript.

e. Research and Referencing:

The final parameter entails a review of the quality of information expounded and the authorities on which it is based. With respect to referencing, the editor takes note whether an adequate number of references have been used in the manuscript. The editor also judges the referencing based on the quality of the sources relied upon in the manuscript by the author. It is appreciated if a manuscript has a good balance between primary and secondary sources used.

Some additional pointers that authors can keep in mind are:

- As far as research is concerned, red flags include not taking into consideration landmark events, cases, legislation, not delving deep into the subject matter, etc.

- Referencing is prima facie the most objective criterion. Good referencing is based on knowing when to cite, when not to cite, and the quality of the citation.
- The author must ensure that statements of law and fact, as opposed to arguments and analyses, are backed with adequate authorities.
- Quality of references is generally indicated through preference given to academic authorities such as books, journals, treaties, case law, etc., as opposed to newspaper articles and blogs. While the quality of the citation depends on the content it offers, the following loose hierarchy can aid the editors in their review: (Primary Sources) Treaties, legislation, cases, parliamentary or executive reports > (Secondary Sources I) Reputed NGO/research centre reports, literature by experts in the field, literature by eminent scholars who may not be experts > (Secondary Sources II) Other literature, newspapers, blogposts, etc.
- In terms of quantity, both over-citation, as well as a thorough lack of the same, must be avoided.

d. Peer Review

Manuscripts shortlisted after the two stages of Content Review are forwarded to external reviewers for double-blind peer review. Reviewers are selected based on subject expertise and are independent of the Editorial Board.

For a detailed understanding of the same, the authors are requested to read the Peer Review Policy [here](#).

e. Pre-Publication Review

The Pre-Publication Review represents the final stage of the editorial process conducted after the manuscript has successfully undergone and passed the two stages of Technical Review and Content Review each, and the Peer Review. This stage ensures that every manuscript accepted for publication meets the highest standards of academic precision, stylistic consistency, and editorial integrity before finalisation for print and online dissemination. The aim is to ensure that the final version of the manuscript reflects both the author's intent and the Review's publication standards.

Elements of the Pre-publication review are described below:

i. Incorporation of Editorial and Peer Review Comments-

At this stage, editors verify that all feedback and comments from the Technical, Content, and Peer Review stages have been fully incorporated. The revised manuscript is compared against the tracked versions or review notes to ensure that required changes including but not limited to clarification of arguments, correction of errors, and structural improvements have been implemented. Any omissions or unresolved issues by the author are communicated to them again before final approval.

ii. Grammar and Language Review-

The manuscript is reviewed for accuracy of grammar, clarity of expression, and consistency of tone. Editors ensure that the text is coherent, punctuations are appropriate, sentences are grammatically sound, and transitions between paragraphs are smooth. The overall readability and flow of arguments are also assessed.

iii. Citation Verification (OSCOLA 4th Edition)-

A thorough citation check is conducted to confirm adherence to the OSCOLA 4th edition referencing style. Editors verify the accuracy and completeness of every citation, ensuring that case names, statutes, books, and articles are correctly cited. Cross-references such as *ibid.*, *supra*, or *infra* are checked for consistency, and incorrect or incomplete citations are rectified before publication.

iv. Cross-Referencing Consistency-

All internal references, including cross-citations, footnote numbers, and textual references, are checked for accuracy and uniformity. Editors confirm that every citation or reference in the text corresponds correctly to its source and that numbering and headings align with the final edited version. Any inconsistencies are corrected before the manuscript proceeds to layout.

v. Punctuation and Formatting Review-

A detailed punctuation and formatting review is undertaken to ensure professional presentation. Editors check the correct use of punctuation marks, spacing, indentation, italics, and quotation marks as per British English conventions. Minor typographical and stylistic inconsistencies are corrected to maintain uniformity across all published manuscripts.

vi. Syntax and Structural Consistency-

The final review ensures that sentence structures are clear and logical, arguments flow seamlessly, and headings and subheadings are formatted uniformly. Editors eliminate redundant or overly complex constructions and ensure syntactic precision without altering the author's substantive intent.

vii. Final Approval-

After completion of the Pre-Publication Review, the manuscript is submitted to the Editor-in-Chief and Deputy Editor-in-Chief for final verification. Publication proceeds only once the editorial team confirms that all required revisions are incorporated, grammar and citations are accurate, and the manuscript adheres to all NLIU Law Review standards. Upon approval, the manuscript is marked Publication-Ready and forwarded for typesetting and printing.

EDITORIAL DISCRETION

The Editorial Board retains the authority to:

- accept, suggest revisions to, or reject any manuscript at any stage of the process;
- return manuscripts to authors for substantive revision before further consideration; and
- disqualify manuscripts in cases of ethical or procedural violations.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All manuscripts under review are treated as confidential documents. No part of the manuscript will be disclosed beyond the Editorial Board, Peer Reviewers, or affiliated service providers involved in the review and publication process.

The authors can also refer to the Privacy Policy given here for more information regarding the confidentiality of the whole review process.

PREPARED BY

ADITI SHREYA
(EDITOR-IN-CHIEF)

GAURI AGARWAL
(DEPUTY-EDITOR-IN-CHIEF)

LAVYA BHASIN
(CONTENT BOARD HEAD)

SWATI GIRI
(CONTENT BOARD HEAD)

DEEPANSHU SONI
(BLOG HEAD)



NLIU LAW REVIEW
2025-26

