

ILM Peer Review Policy

ILM Peer Review Model

ILM uses a double anonymous peer review process. That means that the authors do not know the identity of the reviewers, and the reviewers do not know the identity of the authors prior to publication.

The editors mediate all interactions between reviewers and authors by means of the Scholar One manuscript management software.

The peer reviews are not published to allow for the most candid interactions for the benefit of the authors.

The reviews are fully owned by Issues in Law and Medicine.

Becoming a Reviewer for Issues in Law and Medicine

Authors who have benefited from the peer review process should consider becoming peer reviewers as a part of their professional responsibilities. Issues in Law and Medicine selects peer reviewers for submitted manuscripts based on the reviewer's expertise and experience in fields which match the subject matter of the manuscript.

In order to assign appropriate reviewers, potential reviewers should provide journals with sufficient personal and professional information to establish a fair representation of their expertise, including verifiable and accurate contact information.

Similarly, notify the editors as soon as possible if you find you do not have the necessary expertise to assess the relevant aspects of a manuscript after you have begun the review process so as not to unduly delay the review process.

Competing Interests/Conflicts of Interest

Ensure you declare all potential competing, or conflicting, interests. If you are unsure about a potential competing interest that may prevent you from reviewing, reply to the requesting email from Scholar One, explaining the nature of the potential conflict and the editors will evaluate and reply to you promptly.

Competing interests are those aspects of your professional and personal experience which would prevent you from giving an objective and unbiased review of the subject matter of the manuscript, and can include financial, personal, professional, or other aspects which could interfere with an objective review.

If you are currently employed at the same institution as any of the authors or have been recent (eg, within the past 3 years) mentors, mentees, close collaborators, or joint grant holders, you should not agree to review.

In addition, you should not agree to review a manuscript just to gain sight of it with no intention of submitting a review or agree to review a manuscript that is very similar to one you have in preparation or under consideration at another journal.

Issues in Law and Medicine uses a double-anonymous review process. If you suspect the identity of the author(s) notify the journal if this knowledge raises any potential competing or conflict of interest.

Timeliness

It is courteous to respond to an invitation to peer review within a week, to let the editors know if you are able or not able to undertake the review. If you feel qualified to judge a particular manuscript, you should agree to review only if you are able to return a review within the proposed or mutually agreed time frame. Always inform the journal promptly if your circumstances change and you cannot fulfil your original agreement or if you require an extension.

If you cannot review, it is helpful to make suggestions for alternative reviewers if relevant, based on their expertise and without any influence of personal considerations or any intention of the manuscript receiving a specific outcome (either positive or negative).

Please reply to the Scholar One request to peer review if anything is not clear and request any missing or incomplete items you need.

Confidentiality

Reviewers should respect the confidentiality of the peer review process and refrain from using information obtained during the peer review process for your own or another's advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others. Do not involve anyone else in the review of a manuscript (including early career researchers you are mentoring), without first obtaining permission from the journal. The names of any individuals who have helped with the review should be included so that they are associated with the manuscript in the journal's records and can also receive due recognition for their efforts.

Suspected Ethics Violations

Please promptly contact the journal via the Scholar One portal if you have concerns that misconduct occurred during either the research or the writing and submission of the manuscript, or if you notice substantial similarity between the manuscript and a concurrent submission to another journal or a published article. In the case of these or any other ethical concerns, contact the editor directly and do not attempt to investigate on your own. It is appropriate to cooperate, in confidence, with the journal, but not to personally investigate further unless the journal asks for additional information or advice.

Transferability of Peer Review

If a manuscript is rejected from one journal and submitted to another, and you are asked to review that same manuscript, you should be prepared to review the manuscript afresh as it may have changed between the two submissions and the criteria for evaluation and acceptance may be different between the two journals. In the interests of transparency and efficiency it may be appropriate to provide your original review for the new journal (with permission to do so from the original journal), explaining that you had reviewed the submission previously and noting any changes.