

## **The Peer Review Policy**

The Kamkus Law Journal has earned the title of India's premier law journal, and it is widely distributed throughout the country. It publishes well-researched papers about current legal trends. All students and academicians are welcome to submit an article to the publication.

### **Submission of Paper**

Interested authors can submit their paper to the journal. Details of authors and the manuscript are to be submitted using this email and the manuscript should not contain any identification marks.

### **Executive Editor Assessment**

The Executive Editor checks the paper's composition and arrangement against the journal's submission guidelines to make sure it includes the required sections and stylizations. The quality of the paper is not assessed at this point.

### **Plagiarism Assessment**

Plagiarism is the "wrongful appropriation" and "stealing and publication" of another author's "language, thoughts, ideas, or expressions" and the representation of them as one's own original work.

The journal's editorial board runs a plagiarism test using an anti-plagiarism software to check the documents to ensure that the manuscript does not contain any unauthorized version of someone else's work.

During the plagiarism check, the team ignores "Quotes" and "Footnoted" content as they do not fall under the plagiarism definition.

### **Appraisal by the Editor-in-Chief (EIC)**

The Executive Editor after plagiarism test must communicate the update to the EIC. The Editor-in-Chief checks that the paper is appropriate for the journal and is sufficiently original and interesting. If not, the paper may be rejected without being reviewed any further.

### **EIC Assigns an Associate Editor (AE)**

Our journals have Associate Editors who handle the peer review. If they do, they would be assigned at this stage.

### **Invitation to Reviewers**

The handling editor sends out invitations to people he or she thinks would be good reviewers. As answers come in, more invitations are sent out, if necessary, until the required number of acceptances is reached, which is usually 2 but varies depending on the publication.

### **Response to Invitations**

Potential reviewers consider the invitation against their own expertise, conflicts of interest and availability. They then accept or decline. If possible, when declining, they might also suggest alternative reviewers.

### **Review is conducted**

The reviewer sets time aside to read the paper several times. The first read is used to form an initial impression of the work. If major problems are found at this stage, the reviewer may feel comfortable. Otherwise, they will read the paper several more times, taking notes so as to build a detailed Point-By-Point Review. After the Point-by-Point Review Phase, the papers are forwarded for a second Stage Double-Blind Peer Review. The Review is conducted in 2 stages namely.

### **The Facts Check Stage**

The Editorial Team who is solely responsible to cross check all the facts mentioned in the manuscript. If the Facts Finder Team finds any contradicting facts, the papers get rejected. However, if minor changes are required, the Fact Finders are authorized to make such changes. Furthermore, the Reviewers are empowered to send the paper back to the author if major changes are required.

### **Language Check Stage**

In the Language Check Stage, the team generally checks the overall language of the manuscript along with Spelling Mistakes & Grammatical Errors. The recommendation to accept or reject it or else with a request for revision (usually flagged as either major or minor) before it is reconsidered.

### **Journal Evaluates the Reviews**

The handling editor considers all the returned reviews before making an overall decision. If the reviews differ widely, the editor may invite an additional reviewer so as to get an extra opinion before making a decision.

### **The Decision is communicated**

The editor sends a decision email to the author including any relevant reviewer comments (in a personal one-on-one email communication if required). Whether the comments are anonymous or not will depend on the type of peer review that the journal operates.

### **Final Publication**

The paper is then sent to production if it is approved. If the article is rejected or returned for significant or minor change, the handling editor should include the reviewers' helpful suggestions to assist the author in improving the article. Reviewers should also send an email or a letter at this stage informing them of the outcome of their review. Unless they have opted out of future participation, reviewers should expect to get a fresh version if the work was sent back for editing. However, where only small changes are requested, the handling editor may conduct the follow-up review.

### **Post Publication Review**

In Post Publication Review, the possibility to review and revise an article after it has been published is still available. Along with the published work, this could be in the form of a comments page or a discussion forum. Importantly, post-publication peer review does not preclude other types of peer review and is typically performed in addition to, rather than in instead of, pre-publication review. The Editorial Team of the Journal has the authority to make modifications to the published manuscript even after it has been published if it is deemed essential for quality control purposes.