

ERCL Review Policy

1. All articles must be submitted to the assistant-editor (at present Florentine Schreiter, schreiter@rewi.hu-berlin.de), who acknowledges receipt and forwards them immediately to the editors responsible for the 'Articles' section (presently Stefan Grundmann and Martijn Hesselink).
2. The editors responsible for the 'Articles' section immediately reject: a) articles that are off-topic (taking into account that we understand 'European contract law' very broadly), and b) articles that are clearly well below our quality standards (see below). All other articles are sent (not anonymously because that would be futile) to two reviewers.
3. The reviewers are invited by the editors (cc to the assistant-editor) to review the article, within three weeks, on the basis of ERCL's quality standards. The main standard for evaluation is academic quality, in particular whether the article makes an innovative contribution to the field and whether it is methodologically sound and based on reliable findings. The reviewer is invited to keep in mind that ERCL aims to be a top ten journal (which we currently are in Europe). The reviewer's verdict should be motivated. This does not have to be long; usually, a few paragraphs will suffice.
4. After having received the reviews the editors responsible for the Articles section decide on publication.
 - A) In the case of two negative reviews the articles will normally be rejected. In the case of two positive reviews the article will normally be published. If the editors responsible for the Articles section think that the (double positive or double negative) verdict of the reviewers should be overruled they refer the article to the complete editorial board for a decision.
 - B) In case the peer reviewers are divided (one reviewer recommends publication while the other proposes rejection), a more substantive judgment from the editors will be required. In case of doubt (or controversy) the article can be referred to the complete board of editors.
5. All rejections and acceptances are communicated to the authors by the assistant-editor. These are always motivated (may be very summary). Normally the peer reviewer's motivation will be sent to the authors after having been made anonymous.