



Peer Review Policy

UCPH Fiscal Relations Law Journal (FIRE Journal)

UCPH Fiscal Relations Law Journal is an academic journal and considers peer review essential to its publication process. We expect peer reviewers to provide an independent and impartial assessment of submissions.

1 Aim of the journal

FIRE Journal aims to be the ideal publication platform for innovative and entrepreneurial lawyers, scholars, and students writing on a broad array of topics relating to fiscal law. The journal's editors accept interdisciplinary contributions that combine fiscal law with another legal field or another discipline, such as mathematics, theology, or computer science.

The journal welcomes innovative research that applies new methods or theories or offers new solutions to fiscal problems. Thus, research on e.g. sustainability issues and the United Nation's 17 Sustainable Development Goals is much welcome. Without disregarding traditional concerns of fiscal law, the journal is interested in analyses of new fiscal concerns and their critical assessment. Submissions are required, however, to address fiscal law or fiscal law issues in some way.

The main purpose of the journal is to present scholarly investigations of national and international fiscal law to an audience of legal professionals. Contributions should be written in a straightforward style that invites the broadest possible audience.

2 Review process

1. Submissions are first examined by the associate editor. The associate editor determines whether the submission falls within the scope of the journal, and whether it fulfils the formal requirements. The associate editor may reject a manuscript without obtaining a referee report from an outside reviewer, if the submission is considered unsuitable for publication in the journal. Reasons for such a decision may include the quality, the originality of the analysis, suitability of the topic for the journal etc. Prior to submission, authors are advised to consult previous issues of the journal in order to judge the suitability of their manuscript for the journal.
2. The journal aims to provide the initial assessment of the submission by the associate editor within 30 working days after receiving it.
3. If the associate editor considers the submission to be generally suitable for the journal, the submission is then forwarded to peer review. Contributions are typically sent to two or three reviewers. Based on the reviewers' advice, the editors decide, if the contribution is suitable for publication with or without revisions, or rejected. Rejected submissions may not resubmitted.
4. The journal employs double blind reviewing. Reviewer(s) and the author(s) identities are not disclosed to each other by the editors, and authors are required to submit an anonymized version of their manuscript.

5. Authors may suggest reviewers and request the journal to exclude others; however, the editors make the final decision on the selection of reviewers.
6. The journal is committed to fast editorial decisions and publication of qualified contributions. Reviewers help editors make publication decisions by indicating how to strengthen a submitted manuscript. Reviews should therefore explain weaknesses, so authors can improve their contributions. If the submission is suitable for publication, but needs minor or significant revisions, the author may revise and submit again. Submissions not considered suitable for publication are rejected with no access to resubmission.
7. Reviewers receive no financial compensation, as the journal is non-profit.
8. The editors reserve the right to make alterations as to style, punctuation, grammar etc.
9. Authors of accepted manuscripts receive proofs of their contributions prior to publication. Any corrections are required to be returned within the dates scheduled by the editors.

We ask reviewers to fill out the Assessment Form.