

# AUTHOR GUIDELINES

## I. Submission

EDPL accepts submissions of manuscripts on a rolling basis. We encourage authors to write on all major areas of European data protection law and policy.

Submissions should be sent exclusively through our online manuscript submission system, Scholastica. Submissions by email will not be accepted. Click the button below to be taken to the form.



[Submit via Scholastica](#)

## II. Quality Statement, Editorial Review and General Terms of Publication

Only submissions of excellent quality will be accepted in EDPL. Responsibility of the factual accuracy of a paper rests entirely with the author. All publications must clearly distinguish themselves from the status quo of discussions – in particular through sufficiently broad footnoting and referencing – and provide an added value to those discussions. Contributions should not have been published, nor be pending publication elsewhere.

Manuscripts which have been wholly, substantially, or substantively generated from AI, machine learning, or similar algorithmic tools cannot be published in EDPL. If authors deploy generative AI in the course of their research, it must be referenced in a footnote generative AI as personal communications for OSCOLA (see Section V for example). Generative AI cannot be listed as an author or co-author of a paper, nor can AI be cited as an author.

Whereas opinions and case notes may be more factual and focussed, articles must rely on pre-existing literature and jurisprudence, even if the positions expressed there are to be contradicted. Likewise, submissions relating to very recent developments require less footnoting and referencing than submissions relating to familiar topics. Publications not up to this quality standard will be rejected.

The manuscript must also be complete and final in terms of formulation and factual information so that no major corrections – only of type-setting errors or the like - will be necessary after type-setting, when an edited version will be returned to the author. Subsequent requests for corrections cannot be processed.

The submission of all materials to EDPL implies acceptance by the authors of Lexxion's general Terms and Conditions, Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement and these Author Guidelines, in their integrity.

Authors will receive a free hard copy of the issue after printing. Please note EDPL does not send PDF files of the final article to authors.

### **III. Peer Review**

To ensure the high quality of the journal, all research article submissions will be subject to double blind peer review. Reviewers are chosen based on their topical specialties, work and publication history, and shall be objective, independent and free of conflicts of interest. The choice and assignment of reviewers is at the sole discretion of the Editorial Team; details thereof shall not be discussed or made public, and authors may not make any requests in this regard. The identities of both authors and reviewers shall be protected as much as possible from each other and from any other parties, with the exception of the Editorial Team.

Authors are obliged to take part in the review process by remaining available for any changes, modifications, improvements etc. as may be required by reviewers or the Editorial Team. These shall be considered as mandatory conditions for publication; authors shall strive to adopt them to the widest possible extent. Clear and objective justification shall be given by authors if any request has not been met. The Editorial Team reserves the right to return any insufficiently modified contribution to authors for further work, or to reject its publication.

Country reports, case notes and book reviews submissions will be subject to a simplified review process.

#### **1. Articles Review**

All articles submitted for publication in EDPL undergo a double-blind review process.

Articles submissions are addressed to the executive editor of EDPL who is charged with deciding if the article fits with the general thematic and quality scope of the journal. If the submission passes this check, the executive editor forwards an anonymised version of the article submission to two independent peer reviewers. The first reviewer is a member of the Editorial Board of EDPL. The second reviewer is a recognised expert with knowledge on the topic of the article. The two reviewers are asked to fill in a Review Sheet where they indicate if the article is approved for publication and what revisions (if any) should be done by the author. If the two reviewers disagree whether the article should be published or not, the article is forwarded to a third reviewer whose decision is final.

Authors of accepted articles may still be asked to revise their draft in order to incorporate the feedback of reviewers. One or both reviewers may be asked to do a second review of the revised draft to check if the requested revision was adequately completed.

As a final step, after the content of the article is approved, the text undergoes language and formatting editing.

## **2. Review of Reports, Case Notes and Book Reviews**

Submissions to the Reports, Case Notes, and Book Reviews sections will be subject to a simplified peer review process. The EDPL associate editors in charge of the particular section check the quality of the submissions and provide feedback to the authors. This is not a blind process. The editor may request that the author revises and improves their draft. The revised draft must be approved by the associate editor before it is cleared for publication.

## **IV. Format and Style**

The final version of the submission undergoes language and formatting editing.

All contributions must comply with the minimum formatting requirements laid out hereunder. Contributions not respecting these formatting requirements will be returned to the author.

### **1. FORMAT AND LENGTH**

#### **a. Articles**

Articles should be between 4000–8000 words (including footnotes) in length (MS Word Format, in British English). All contributions use footnotes, but not a list of references. Longer articles are accepted on a case-by-case basis if more space is required by the topic. Each article is preceded by a short abstract (without heading) of five to six sentences.

#### **b. Case Notes**

Case Notes should be between 2000–3000 words (including footnotes) in length. They cover judgements of Court of Justice of the European Union or the European Court of Human Rights. Judgments of nationals courts are presented as country reports in EDPL's Reports section. The overall structure of case notes shall be divided in the Facts, the Judgment and the Comment. It is headed by a short headline in bold that summarises the main issue of the case and the reference of the case in Italics, including its publication in the official journal of the respective Court. In cases where the judgment is not (yet) final, this fact shall be indicated.

#### **c. Reports**

EDPL reports can take the form of (i) flash news, or (ii) prospective articles.

Flash news are meant to give readers a brief overview regarding a news of particular interest (normative, judicial, academic and practical developments in pre-defined policy areas and themes at the interface of science and law). In light of their quasi-journalistic nature, they should be concise and not more than 1500 words (no bibliography is required) in length. They highlight a topic of particular interest relating to legal developments in the EU Member States or third countries with a clear link to European privacy and data protection law.

Perspective articles, on the other hand, should consist of a more detailed contribution, which should both highlight a topic of particular interest and provide readers with some critical and personal comments. In this case, just an embryonic bibliography is required and articles should be between 2000 and 3500 words.

All reports provide readers with the facts, as well as some critical and personal comments.

## d. Book Reviews

Book reviews should be up to 1500 words in length (standard book review) or up to 3000 words (critical book review). The standard book reviews detail the contribution and structure of the book and give a critical appraisal of its strengths and weaknesses. The critical book review essay, in addition to detailing the contribution and structure of the book, should also critically assess its arguments with a focus on key theoretical issues.

## 2. PRESENTATION

### a. Title

Every word in the title should be capitalised except for conjunctions (Headline Capitalisation). The title's length should not exceed three lines after typeset (max. 150 characters including spaces).

Subtitles are allowed and should also not exceed the 3 lines rule (max. 200 characters including spaces).

### b. Authors' Details

Author(s) details should be included in a first asterisk footnote (\*) inserted after the author's/authors name(s). The footnote should include the full name(s) of the author(s), their role or position, affiliated institution and region, and their email address.

*Example:*

**Article Title**

*Christopher Bovis\**

.....

\* Prof Dr Christopher Bovis FRSA, H K Bevan Chair in Law, Law School, University of Hull, United Kingdom; Managing Editor of the European Procurement and Public Private Partnership Law Review (EPPPL). For correspondence: <epppl@lexxion.eu>.

*To do so:* In the References ribbon tab, click the Footnotes launcher (lower right corner in the Footnotes section). There, place an asterisk into the Custom mark: box, then click Insert, and type your footnote text.

All further footnotes should be numbered sequentially in superscript in the text outside punctuation marks.

## 3. TABLES AND FIGURES

Tables and figures should be submitted on extra pages. Every table should have a title. The relevant sources of the data presented or of the tables or figures themselves should be indicated. Within the text, the position at which a table is to be included should be marked by '[TABLE ...]', the tables and figures being clearly numbered. Every table should be referred to.

To ease the typesetting process, please keep formatting within tables to a minimum (e.g., avoid merged cells or the use of vertical text for headings).

## **4. ABSTRACT**

Each article is preceded by a short abstract (without heading) in italics of five to six sentences, without footnotes (approx. 200 words)

## **5. HEADINGS**

Every word in a heading should be capitalised except for conjunctions (Headline Capitalisation). The headings should be structured as follows:

H1: I. (starting with the introduction)

H2: 1.

H3: a.

H4: i.

## **V. Quotation and Referencing**

All references should be included in the footnotes: no final bibliographies are allowed. The reference style is OSCOLA. All contributions should be submitted in British English.

[Full guide \(OSCOLA 4th edition\)](#)

[Quick guide](#)

Until official guidance is released, authors should reference generative AI under OSCOLA 3.4.11, 'Personal communications' (full guide).

*Example of citation in footnotes:*

ChatGPT 3 response to prompt to outline 3 implementation challenges of the Digital Markets Act (22 June 2023).