



## REVIEW POLICY

Corpus Juris is an open access, peer reviewed Journal, published under the aegis of Adv. Sunil Chauhan, which aims at generating dialogue on matters of current interest. The journal does not restrict its authors by any specific theme, allowing professionals, academic researchers and law students to express views on matters of their interest. It is a humble attempt to reinstate the lost atmosphere of legal research and progress.

Keeping this in view, the Journal follows a policy of “**Double Blind Peer Review**” to review all manuscripts received for publication. Under this policy, the Author does not know the identity of the Reviewer reviewing their Manuscript, and similarly, the Reviewer does not the identity of the Author of the Manuscript being reviewed by them.

Once a Manuscript is received by the Journal, it undergoes the following review procedure:

1. Upon receipt, a confirmation of receipt email is sent to the Author(s) of the Manuscript. The email duly contains a timeline for review of the Manuscript received, along with information about the Manuscript Processing Charge (subject to the acceptance of the Manuscript). No Manuscript Processing Charge is to be paid by the Author(s) if their Manuscript has been rejected by the Journal.
2. After receipt, details of the Author(s) are recorded in the database of the Journal, and a Plagiarism Check of the Manuscript is conducted by the administrative team of the Journal. While it is rare for Manuscripts to be rejected at this stage, if a Manuscript has more than 20% similarity index, then a rejection is communicated to the Author(s).

3. If a Manuscript clears the Plagiarism Check, then it is assigned to a Reviewer on the Panel of Reviewers. The Panel of Reviewers is selected for each Issue of the Journal from amongst several applicants, after the successful completion of three rounds of selection, including an interview.
4. The Reviewer then duly comments on the Manuscript, making such edits as they feel necessary for the Publication of the Manuscript, keeping in view the Guidelines provided to them (such as legal backing of arguments made, logical flow of the text and coherency of arguments). After scrutinizing the Manuscript, the Reviewer may recommend one of the following outcomes:
  - a. Publication of the Manuscript, as it is.
  - b. Publication of the Manuscript, subject to the edits suggested.
  - c. Rejection of the Manuscript.
5. An Editor on the Editorial Board, after going through the Comments made by the Reviewer, and keeping in mind their recommendation for the Manuscript, adds comments to the Manuscript, if required, and then makes the final decision on the Publication of the Manuscript. The final decision may be:
  - a. Acceptance and Publication of the Manuscript, without any edits.
  - b. Acceptance and Publication of the Manuscript, subject to the edits recommended by the Reviewer and the Editorial Board.
  - c. Rejection of the Manuscript.
6. In all cases, a decision on the final acceptance or rejection of the Manuscript will lie with the Editorial Board, with the utmost importance being given to the recommendation made by the Panel of Reviewers.