

Groningen Journal of International Law: Peer Review Standards

GroJIL kindly requests that peer reviewing of its articles is undertaken according to the following criteria:

1. Structure

2. Content

2.1. Academic standards

2.1.1. Use of (legal) sources

2.1.2. Proper referencing

2.1.3. Statement of problem and thesis statement

2.2. Logic and argumentation

2.2.1. Faulty logic?

2.2.2. Developing argumentation

2.2.3. Solution/conclusion to pre-stated problem (cf. 2.1.3)

2.2.4. Discerning and nuanced argumentation

2.3. Publishing profile

2.3.1. New/innovative argument

2.3.2. Focus on how argument contributes to change/improvement

2.3.3. Critical perspective

3. Language

Explanatory Notes

Introduction

You are requested to perform your peer review based on three main criteria:

- (1) Structure
- (2) Content
- (3) Language

Content is undoubtedly the most important element. The structure and language are relevant only insofar as they relate to content, meaning (1) and (3) should be evaluated with content in mind. The structure and language must facilitate the content and not weaken the author's arguments.

We encourage that the peer review contains both positive and negative feedback, which concentrates on the big picture, allowing the author to make appropriate changes to the article.

(1) Structure

We are interested in your opinion regarding the author's use of paragraph distribution and headings facilitating his/her argument. Is the set-up and flow of arguments unclear, messy or unbalanced? Is there a natural build-up of the article, or could the author improve his/her argument by employing a different structure?

(2) Content

(2.1) Academic Standards

- (2.1.1) The author must make use of (legal) sources to highlight methods, alternatives, theories and modes of interpretation that may shed more light on a future solution. The author should treat sources with a critical view, and must not be blind to the (possible) shortcomings of his/her sources. However, over-reliance on sources is not desirable.
- (2.1.2) The author must provide full and clear references
- (2.1.3) The introduction should outline the rest of the article in an informative way.

(2.2) Logic and Argumentation

- (2.2.1) The argumentation must not contain faulty logic.
- (2.2.2) The author must leave out irrelevant content, and the article should not include unexplained digressions.
- (2.2.3) The article should progress on the basis of a clearly understood problem, for which the author suggests a solution or conclusion. There should be a plausible link between the pre-stated problem and the solution offered.
- (2.2.4) The author should make use of discerned and nuanced argumentation, acknowledging and addressing opinions that are critical to his or her argument.

(2.3) Publishing Profile

- (2.3.1) The avenue leading to the legal solutions should be innovative, whilst remaining situated within a concrete legal context.
- (2.3.2) The author should offer credible and helpful solutions, employing legal examples, logic and by having recourse to analogy.
- (2.3.3) The author should address theoretical/practical shortcomings and difficulties surrounding his or her solutions.

(3) Language

We would like clear academic and legal language to be used throughout the articles, whilst ensuring accessibility for readers. We have a strong preference for concise language, and the avoidance of long, complicated sentences.