

# AUTHOR GUIDELINES

## I. Submission

Submission of a manuscript does not guarantee publication. Before submitting a manuscript, the editors may be contacted regarding the suitability of a topic for EPPPL.

Spontaneous contributions are welcome and should be sent by [e-mail](#) to the Executive Editor Adelaide McCluskey.

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

Only submissions of excellent quality will be accepted in EPPPL. Responsibility for 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 add value to the existing discourse. Contributions should not have been published or 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 EPPPL. If authors deploy generative AI in the course of their research, they must reference in a footnote. Generative AI cannot be listed as an author or co-author of a paper, nor can AI be cited in the references as an author.

Country reports, case law annotations and case notes may be more factual and focused, articles and international/interdisciplinary discussion papers must rely on the 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 be finalised so that no major corrections will be necessary after typesetting, when an edited version will be returned to the author for final checking. Subsequent requests for corrections cannot be processed.

## III. Review Process

All articles submitted to EPPPL are subject to a double-blind peer-review process and evaluated for accuracy, quality, novelty and relevance. The peer-review process is an essential and integral part of research and publication.

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

Articles may be rejected, accepted pending minor or major modifications, or accepted as is. Authors are advised that the vast majority of papers must be adapted to some extent before being accepted for publication. All authors, regardless of position, origin or status, are expected to respect the comments and suggestions of reviewers and those of the Editorial Team.

## IV Format and Style

EPPPL's official referencing and style guide is OSCOLA 4<sup>th</sup> edition, supplemented by the points in this Guideline.

All contributions must comply with these formatting requirements. 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). Longer articles are accepted on a case-by-case basis.

#### b. Case Annotations

Case annotations should be between 2000–3000 words (including footnotes). They should be structured as follows:

- a short headline that summarises the main issue of the case and the reference of the case, including its publication in the official journal of the respective Court;
- the background facts of the case;
- the judgment; and
- the author's comments.

Case notes discuss rulings by the European Courts; national judgments are covered in country reports. In cases where the judgment is not (yet) final, this fact shall be indicated.

#### c. Country Reports

Country reports should be between 2000-3500 words (including footnotes) 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 public procurement law and PPPs. The reports provide readers with the facts, as well as some critical and personal comments.

## d. International/Interdisciplinary Papers

Discussion papers for the section “International & Interdisciplinary” should be between 4000-5000 words (including footnotes, no reference list). Discussion papers should highlight international and interdisciplinary developments and implications for practice at a high level. Topics should either be of international relevance, discussing developments in jurisdictions outside the EU, or interdisciplinary. The section welcomes articles from scholars of different backgrounds, including law, economics, political and social sciences, technology, and science, if relevant for public procurement and PPP.

## e. Book Reviews

Book reviews should be between 1000 – 3000 words (including footnotes) in length. The review should provide details about the contribution and structure of the book, as well as assess critically the books arguments focusing on key philosophical or 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 typesetting (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**

*David Freestone\**

.....

\*Prof David Freestone, Lobingier Visiting Professor of Comparative Law and Jurisprudence, George Washington University Law School, Washington, D.C., USA. For correspondence: <dfreestone@law.gwu.edu>.

*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.

## 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.

Formatting within tables and figures must be kept to a minimum (eg avoid merged cells or the use of vertical text for headings).

## 4. ABSTRACT

All submissions, except country reports and book reviews, should be preceded by a short abstract (without heading) in italics of five to six sentences (approximately 200 words), without footnotes.

## 5. HEADING

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.

## IV. Quotation and Referencing

All references should be included in the footnotes: no final bibliographies are allowed. The reference style is OSCOLA 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Note that footnote references should be placed *outside* punctuation marks. All contributions should be submitted in British English.

For CJEU Cases and European Commission Decisions and documents, use preferably the forms given below instead.

Case reference | *short name* | [Court collections year] volume and page | paragraph number

or

Case reference | *short name* | [year] ECLI number | paragraph number

*Example:*

*Case C-280/00 Altmark* [2003] ECR I-7747 paras 88-90.

*Case C-579/16 P FIH Holding* [2018] ECLI:EU:C:2018:159.

*Case E-12/11 Konkurrenten.no AS* [2011] EFTA Ct. Rep. 266.

Case short names are in italics. For judgments not yet registered in the Court collections, the date of judgment is to be given and an indication that the judgment is not yet reported (n.y.r.).

*Example:*

Joined Cases T-80/06 and T-182/09 *Budapest Erőmű* judgment of 13.02.2012, not yet reported para 57.

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).