

# Peer review procedure for REALaw

## REALaw peer review

1. Authors must submit their REALaw contributions to the managing editor via e-mail [k.j.de.graaf@rug.nl](mailto:k.j.de.graaf@rug.nl). Upon receipt of each contribution he will determine – if necessary after consultation with a member of the Editorial Board – whether the content of the contribution falls within the scope of REALaw. If this is the case and if the contribution appears to be of sufficient quality, a peer review procedure will be initiated. The procedure will be as follows:

2. REALaw peer review will be conducted by at least two referees from the REALaw Editorial Board and/or the Editorial Advisory Board. In special cases the Editorial Board may decide to invite a referee from outside the Editorial Advisory Board.

3. Upon accepting the assignment, the referee will assess the author's contribution within a period of 14 days. The referee's assessment will be based on the assessment form approved by the Editorial Board (see page 2), which the referee will submit to the managing editor via e-mail.

4) The author will receive the assessment within one month. The acceptance of the author's contribution as an academic article after REALaw peer review will be stated in the publication of the article.



# Peer review procedure for REALaw

## REALaw peer review assessment form

The main criterion for acceptance is whether the contribution is of good/excellent quality with regard to the state of knowledge in the field of European Administrative Law.

1. Is the article based on a relevant research question and does it make an innovative contribution to existing legal knowledge and/or the legal and social debate?  
agree      disagree
2. Does the article provide new insights for further legal research or the resolving of legal issues concerning European administrative law?  
agree      disagree
3. Does the article demonstrate profoundness, is it methodically sound and does it provide clear and systematic insight into the author's line of thought and reasoning?  
agree      disagree
4. Are the conclusions and findings sufficiently supported?  
agree      disagree
5. Does the article provide a relevant overview of and insight into recent developments and prominent literature in the field of the subject discussed?  
agree      disagree

Confidential comments to the managing editor:

Comments to the author:

Recommendation:

- Accept
- Minor revisions necessary
- Major revisions necessary
- Reject

I hereby declare that I am not in any relevant way related to the author or involved in the subject of the contribution.

Place,

date,

signature

.....,

.....,

.....