

## **Guidelines for Peer Review Process<sup>1</sup>**

*The Business Lawyer (TBL)* is a peer-reviewed journal. That means that every published article has been reviewed and commented on by practitioners, academics, or judges who are knowledgeable in their fields. Peer reviewers do a tremendous service to the Section and to the profession by assisting in the editorial process. The peer review process is an integral part of making *TBL* one of the most respected academic journals in the area of business law.

The peer review process consists of two phases: a preliminary peer review and a full peer review. Prior to the peer review process, the Editor in Chief (EIC) will conduct an initial screening to determine if the article may be of interest to section membership and could be of publishable quality.

### **Preliminary Peer Review**

1. If the EIC determines that the article may be worthy of further consideration, but would like member input into whether the article should be published, the EIC will request a member of the Editorial Board, a Committee or Subcommittee chair, or another section member for a preliminary peer review. More than one person may be asked to do a preliminary review.
2. When asked to do a preliminary peer review, the reviewer should normally respond within *one week* regarding the reviewer's opinion on whether the article should be rejected or should be subject to further peer review, and possible publication. The reviewer should consider whether the article covers new ground that has not already been covered in the literature, has sufficient analytical depth and rigor (including accurate discussion of the relevant substantive law), and is well written.
3. If the article gets a positive recommendation after a preliminary review, the article will be subjected to a further full peer review. In that case, the reviewer who has conducted the preliminary review may be asked to do the fuller peer review.

### **Full Peer Review**

1. A full peer review means that the reviewer is asked to make substantive comments and suggestions for changes to the article in order to make the article publishable and substantively sound. For example, the reviewer may suggest that the author include a discussion of particular cases, statutes, or regulations in order to make the article substantively complete. Or, the reviewer may indicate that a section needs to be reorganized, or a transition paragraph should be included to make the article read more smoothly, or that a section of the article should be cut or expanded.

Please be objective in your review of the article as *TBL* has a tradition of publishing articles from a variety of viewpoints. If a peer reviewer disagrees with the arguments made in an

---

<sup>1</sup> These Guidelines are based upon the guidelines developed by Lynne B. Barr and Charlie M. McCallum during their respective terms as EIC.

Final: June 24, 2009

article, the reviewer should indicate that and detail why the reviewer disagrees.

2. The EIC will edit the article for style. In addition, the peer reviewer does not need to worry about the citations in the article. The Executive Editor edits the citations to Bluebook form and copyedits the article. Both the EIC and Executive Editor welcome any comments on omissions or misstatements of facts or law or any style suggestions the peer reviewer would like to offer.

3. A full peer review should be completed within *two weeks* from receiving the article.

4. The EIC will share the peer reviewer's comments with the author. The identity of the peer reviewer is not shared with the author, unless the peer reviewer agrees otherwise. It is often helpful to the authors to discuss comments directly with the peer reviewer.