

Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

1. AIMS AND SCOPE OF THE AFLJ

The *Australian Feminist Law Journal* ('AFLJ' or 'Journal') publishes scholarship on feminist approaches to law and justice, broadly conceived. Founded in 1993, the AFLJ has been an important intellectual home for feminist legal scholarship from Australia, the Asia Pacific, and beyond. The Journal welcomes high-quality submissions informed by diverse critical and feminist legal traditions, including (but not limited to): cultural and literary, Indigenous, post/de-colonial, critical race, Marxist, queer, psychoanalytic, political economy, post-structuralist, and socio-legal approaches. Please see the Journal's full [Aims & Scope](#) for more information.

2. GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR PEER REVIEW

Peer review plays a vital role in the AFLJ community. Peer review builds scholarly community through exchange and feedback, supports a rich feminist praxis of mentoring and supporting feminist scholars, and maintains the Journal's high standard of scholarship. The Journal gratefully acknowledges this reciprocal gift economy of volunteer labour by feminist scholars as the foundation that makes our work possible.

The AFLJ adheres to the Committee on Publication Ethics' (COPE) basic principles and standards on [ethical peer review](#) and expects peer reviewers to be familiar with these guidelines, including regarding professional responsibility, competing interests, timeliness, confidentiality and suspicion of ethics violations.

The AFLJ adopts a double-anonymous model of peer review. This means neither the author/s nor the peer reviewer/s are aware of each other's identity.

Peer reviewers are asked to read manuscripts in a critical but constructive manner. We ask that peer reviewers strive for a deep engagement working with – not against – the manuscript.

We recommend that peer reviewers write their report as a letter to the Editors rather than a direct reply to the author/s. Ensure the tone of your report is generous and constructive. The Journal does not tolerate offensive or hostile language, sexism, racism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism or any other form of hate speech. The Editors reserve the right to: excise any offensive language in a peer review report before returning to the author/s; send the report back to a peer reviewer to amend; and/or solicit a new report in cases where reports contain offensive or hostile language.

The Journal seeks to be inclusive of emerging scholars, including scholars from the Global South. If you have received a manuscript where it appears that English may not be the native language of the author/s, we ask peer reviewers to read generously. There is no expectation that peer reviewers conduct a detailed, line-by-line copy-edit for language clarity and expression. However, any suggestions regarding improvements to

phrasing or wording would of course be highly welcomed by the Editors and authors. If a manuscript is accepted, a further stage of copy-editing will be conducted after peer review.

3. WRITING YOUR REPORT

The Editors recommend that reports are at least 1 page to in order to substantiate the reviewer's recommendation and be of most assistance to the Editors.

In line with the [IGLP approach to offering feedback](#), we encourage you to commence your review with a brief re-statement of *what* the manuscript is arguing and *why*, that is, 'reflect as accurately as possible what the [...] author has said as you ... read it'. This can be especially helpful to the Editors when peer reviewers read pieces in different ways. It can also be illuminating to an author to see how the crux of their argument is being read by an expert reader.

Consider the following prompts when writing your report (though you may use a different structure and not all may be relevant to your review):

- i. **Argument and scholarly intervention** – does the manuscript offer a well-articulated argument?
- ii. **Contribution to feminist and/or critical legal theory** – as per the Journal's [Aims & Scope](#), does the manuscript make a contribution to feminist or critical legal theory, and is not merely descriptive, doctrinal or policy directed?
- iii. **Analysis and method** – how well does the manuscript execute the details of its analysis? Is the method clear? Is the structure clear?
- iv. **Engagement with literature and citation practice** – does the manuscript sufficiently engage with the relevant literature in the field and is it well-referenced? Is there appropriate gender-balance of scholars cited, and if the research focuses on the Global South, does it substantively engage with scholars from the Global South etc?
- v. **Other minor/miscellaneous comments:** title, abstract, key words, overall writing style, expression/phrasing, grammar etc.

If you recommend that the author/s needs to add in certain material to deepen their analysis or strengthen their argument, please consider if there are other sections where they may be able to trim down to stay within the word limit.

4. YOUR OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

Your overarching recommendation to the Editors may be:

Accept without changes	Recommendation that the manuscript is accepted to be published as is (except for any minor editing that occurs during the usual copy-editing phase). This review decision is rare.
-------------------------------	--

Accept with minor revisions	Recommendation that the manuscript is accepted on the condition that some small changes are required. These changes may require adding or deleting material, correcting minor errors, adding references etc, but do not require major reworking to the manuscript. Given these are small changes, in most cases the Editors will be able to clearly assess that the revisions have been implemented without needing to go back to the peer reviewers who are experts in the sub-discipline/method/theory.
Accept with major revisions	Recommendation that the manuscript is accepted on the condition that major changes are required. Given these are larger or more substantive changes to the manuscript, in many cases the Editors may need to go back to peer reviewers to assess that the changes have been properly implemented.
Revise & Resubmit	Recommendation that the manuscript is not accepted as is but is given an opportunity to be reconsidered in another round of peer review after major revisions are made. However, undertaking an R&R does not guarantee the manuscript will be accepted (distinguishing it from major revisions).
Reject	Recommendation that the manuscript is rejected and not reconsidered even if major changes are made.

Please note that the *final* editorial decision rests with the Editors. The Editors' final decision may be different from your recommendation because it will also draw upon at least one other (and possibly more) report/s. The Editors will rely more heavily on your *substantive comments* rather than just the overarching recommendation. Please therefore ensure that your substantive comments explain in detail the reasons justifying your view, in order to best assist the Editors in making a determination.

Thank you for the generous contribution of your time and expertise to the work of the AFLJ. If you have any further questions please contact the Editors at aflj@griffith.edu.au.