

AUSTRIAN REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL AND EUROPEAN LAW – ARIEL

PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Manuscripts submitted to the Austrian Review of International and European Law (ARIEL) for consideration as analytical articles or notes on current development first undergo an **internal review** by the editorial team (editors and managing editor). The internal review examines the relevance of the manuscript to the journal's scope and its overall quality to decide whether it is sent into external peer review.

The **external peer review** follows the double-blind (double-anonymized) model, with a minimum of two reviewers providing individual assessments on the quality of the submission. The reviewers are selected by the editorial team based on their subject-matter expertise on the content of the manuscript. Reviewers must disclose any potential conflicts of interest to the editorial team and uphold the confidentiality of the materials provided for review. Authors are provided with detailed comments by the reviewers in a compiled form. The decision is made by the editorial team based on the entirety of the feedback and recommendations provided by the reviewers. That decision may be:

- acceptance w/o revisions
- acceptance following minor revisions
- acceptance following major revisions
- rejection (with invitation to re-submit)
- full rejection

An 'acceptance following minor/major revisions' is conditional upon undertaking revisions in line with feedback from the reviewers, as indicated to authors. If an acceptance is subject to 'major revisions', the editorial team may decide to send the contribution into another round of external peer review. Authors retain their academic independence in the revision process and may also explain the lack of feasibility of any given revision. The final decision on the acceptance of the manuscript is made by the editorial team.

In case of a 'rejection' decision, authors may be invited to re-submit a revised version of their manuscript that takes account of concerns raised by the reviewers. The resubmitted manuscript will undergo an additional external peer review. The editorial team strives to obtain feedback from the same reviewers as in the first round

of peer review, unless authors have a justifiable reason to request a different approach. When submitting the revised manuscript, authors should prepare a response explaining the changes made and/or the reasons for not following the feedback of reviewers. That response will be taken into account by the editorial team when making the final decision on the manuscript.

Manuscripts that have been accepted for publication undergo an additional **editorial review process**, providing feedback aiming to ensure the accessibility, readability and clarity of each submission.

Any queries on the peer review process in general or on any ongoing peer review may be directed to the corresponding editor and/or the managing editor, as indicated in the [ARIEL General Information for Authors](#).

The editorial team adheres to [Brill's Code of Conduct for Editors](#) and [Brill's Publication Ethics](#) during the entire peer review process.

Introductory information for peer reviewers may be found in the [Brill Reviewer Guidelines](#). Further guidance on ethical peer review relevant for peer reviewers can be found in [Brill's Publication Ethics](#).