**CLLRA Journal Peer Review Policy**

Every Journal published by CLLRA is peer reviewed by an expert in the field of Labour law. This ensures that the journal matches up to the highest standards of legal writing and also assesses the factual and legal consistency of the journal.

The peer review process helps improve the quality of the published journal, ensures that the previous work is also acknowledged, determines the importance of findings, detects plagiarism and fraud and plays a central role in academic career development.

1. **The Process**
* The Journal is sent for peer review to an expert in the field of Labour law.
* The peer reviewer may recommend that the journal be accepted without any changes, or that it will be accepted only after incorporating major or minor changes, or they may recommend that the journal be rejected.
* The editors shall communicate the peer reviewer’s decision and comments to the author.
* If the editors deem it suitable, the author will be given the chance to incorporate the changes suggested by the peer reviewer.
* The editors will determine if the author has satisfactorily incorporated the changes suggested by the peer reviewer, in the journal.
* Depending upon the editors’ discretion, there may be more than one round of edits at this stage.
* If the editors believe that the relevant changes have not been made to the journal, they may choose to reject it.
* However, if the editors believe that all the necessary changes have been incorporated, and are satisfied with the journal, they may recommend that the journal be accepted for publication in the CLLRA Journal.
* This final decision regarding the acceptance or rejection of the journal will be communicated to the authors by the editors.
1. **Type of Peer Review**

CLLRA adheres to a rigorous **double-blind peer-review policy** in which the identity of both the reviewer and author are always concealed from both parties.

1. **Queries**

CLLRA Journal editors shall act as a liaison between the author and the peer reviewer. Therefore, if the author has any queries regarding the peer reviewer’s comments, they may inform the same to the editors, who shall communicate the queries to the peer reviewer, and shall get back to the author.

1. **Conflict of Interest**

Authors are requested to kindly disclose the names of those individuals with whom they have previously discussed the journal. These individuals will be barred from peer reviewing the journal. Any failure or mischief on the part of authors in this regard will be dealt with strictly. While soliciting peer reviewers, CLLRA confirms that the peer reviewer has not previously engaged with the relevant journal. This is done keeping in mind the anonymity of the author.​

**5. Number of Peer Reviewers**

**​**If both the editors recommend it, the paper is sent to one peer reviewer. However, there may be further rounds of peer reviews, by different peer reviewers, if the first peer reviewer suggests the same.

CLLRA solicits individuals who are well-versed, and have years of experience, in a particular field of law, to peer review its papers. It maintains quality control by ensuring that only practitioners, academics, or policy experts in a particular field of law peer review a paper.

**6. Metrics of Review**

The peer reviewers must engage with the journal based on the following metrics:

* Identification of issues
* Depth of research
* Analyses, interpretations, and conclusions
* Clarity of argument
* Originality and innovation
* Contribution to the jurisprudence on the issue
* Engagement with the existing literature
* Appropriate and up-to-date references
* Structure and organisation of the journal

The peer reviewer may recommend that the paper be accepted without any comments, or that it be accepted with major or minor changes, or that the paper be rejected. Based on the editors’ discretion, the authors may be given the chance to incorporate the peer reviewer’s suggestions into their paper. This process may entail one or multiple round of reviews. If the editors believe that the paper is satisfactory and the peer reviewer’s comments have been incorporated, they may accept it for publication. However, after these rounds, if the editors feel that the paper is still unsuitable for the Journal, they may recommend that the paper be rejected.

1. **Timeline**

We endeavour to get back to the authors with the peer reviewer’s comments within 1 month from the day it is sent to the peer reviewer. However, this 1 month timeline may get extended, in certain cases, due to delays by the peer reviewers. A final confirmation regarding the acceptance or rejection of the journal can be provided only after the peer reviewer’s comments have been adequately incorporated in the journal.