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A. PROCEDURES

• Authors should send their articles/texts electronically to the following email address: epubli-ca@fd.ul.pt

• Every article/text will be subject of evaluation by an independent and anonymous specialist (double blind peer review), who will be appointed from a pool of reviewers.

• When evaluating the article/text, the reviewer will take into account the present day relevance and interest of the issue, the clarity and suitability of the exposition, the analysis of relevant case law and the compliance with the style norms mentioned below.

• The reviewer must arrive at one of two conclusions: (i) positive; (II) negative. In the latter case, the reviewer shall indicate, in no more than 10 lines, the aspects which should be reformulated in the article. For that purpose, the reviewer will use the “Reviewer’s Form” attached to this Editorial Style Book.

• In case the reviewer recommends a reformulation of the article in his/her evaluation report, the authors will be invited to reformulate their text in accordance with the guidelines indicated in the report.

B. STRUCTURE OF THE ARTICLES

• Articles should preferably be written in Portuguese or English.

• The author must be identified by name in his/her article, along with his/her email address and the institutions, address, zip code, where he/she works, in a footnote.

• The maximum length of an article is 15,000 words; the minimum length is 4,000 words.

• The title of the article must be presented both in Portuguese and in English.

• The author must draft an abstract in Portuguese and English, with a maximum length of 150 words, and also indicate 5 keywords in Portuguese and English.

• The beginning of each article must include a summary of the work, comprising the divisions and sub-divisions of the subjects to be addressed.

• Articles must be presented in Word format and use Times font, size 12, with a line spacing of 1.5.

• Footnotes must also use Times font, in size 10, with simple-spacing.

• Where appropriate, the article shall be divided in numbers (1., 2., 3., etc), sub-numbers (1.1., 1.2., 1.3., etc.) and paragraphs (a), (b), (c), etc.).

• Authors are free to adopt the Portuguese Language Orthographic Agreement of 1990 or the previous orthographic rules.
C. INDICATION OF REFERENCES TO HYPERLINKS

• Articles must include hyperlinks to quoted legislation and bibliography which are available online (including other articles published in previous issues of this Journal).

• It is the author’s responsibility to mark the contents referred in the article which may be subject to a hyperlink due to their availability online. For that purpose, comment boxes of Microsoft Word should be attached to signal the existence of the hyperlink.

D. INDICATION OF REFERENCES TO VIDEOS

• The authors may suggest the inclusion of videos to accompany their articles (e.g. a parliamentary debate, a public statement from a political official, a given event showing the type of problems addressed by the article, etc.). For that purpose, an access link to the video on the internet must be sent with the article.

E. RULES CONCERNING THE BODY OF THE TEXT

• When appropriate, foreign words, including words in Latin, shall be presented in italic, without quotation marks.

• The transcription of passages from works by other authors must be typed between quotation marks, without italic. The type of quotation marks shall be the following: (“...”).

  a. In case the quoted author used quotation marks in the segment which is being transcribed, another type of quotation marks must be used to begin and to end the transcription included in the quoted text: («...»);

• Quotation of ordinals (e.g., 3°) or using the abbreviated reference to “number” (“no”) shall be done with “n.o”.

• The word article (both in singular and plural forms) shall be written in full, instead of through the use of the abbreviated form “art.”.

  a. When quoting the content of an article, the format shall be the following: “sub-paragraph c) of paragraph 1 of article 198° of the Constitution [states/prescribes, etc.] (...)

• References to the Constitution or to Codes (e.g. Code of Administrative Procedure or Code of Public Contracts) must use the complete denomination “Constitution of the Portuguese Republic” or “Constitution”, “Code of Administrative Procedure” or “Code of Public Contracts” rather than the respective acronyms. If the reference is repeated in the text, the first full reference may identify the use of the acronym in future references “henceforth [acronym]” Ex: “henceforth CRP” F. Rules regarding quotations and footnotes
• Authors are encouraged to include at least one quotation from articles published in reviews included in the list of publications of the following databases, which should include the reference to the respective URL:

a. Scopus: http://www.elsevier.com/online-tools/scopus;


d. Latindex: http://www.latindex.unam.mx/

• In order to preserve the anonymity inherent to the double blind peer review system, authors must avoid quotations or references that might reveal his/her identity (e.g. “see our work _____”, “in line with what we sustained in ______ ”). All works by the authors must be quoted, referenced and identified in the same manner as works of any third party.

• Quotations from handbooks/monographs shall be undertaken as follows: [Author’s name in SMALL CAPS], [name of work in italic], [volume, when applicable], [tome, when applicable], [edition], [location of publication], [year of publication], [page or pages] EX: JORGE MIRANDA, Manual de Direito Constitucional, IV, 4.a ed., Coimbra, 2008, pp. 100 ff.

  a. Volume must be identified in roman numerals, followed by arab numerals for the tome, when applicable, hyphenated (ex: II-1)

  b. In case of a reprint, it should be mentioned at the end of the reference (“reimpr.”), before the indication of pages.

  c. Each footnote must begin with a tab.

  d. Works with up to 3 authors, must be identified by the use of all names, separated by a slash: [authors name in SMALL CAPS] [space] [slash] [space] [authors name in SMALL CAPS] – e.g., DIOGO FREITAS DO AMARAL.

  e. Works with more than 3 authors, must only be identified through the use of the name of the first author, follow by a reference to “et alli” or “et al.”, without small caps and in italic. Ex: DIOGO FREITAS DO AMARAL et al., Código do Procedimento Administrativo (...);

  f. A quotation from a single page should be marked “p.” and that of multiple pages “pp.”. Intervals of pages should identify the range “pp. 24-51”.
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g. When referring to pages, the reference to “and following” should be made through the use of the reference to “ff.”

h. From the second quotation of the same text onwards, it can be marked in an abbreviated form, using only the first word(s) in the title, without suspension points Ex: JORGE MIRANDA, Manual, IV, pp. 100 ff..

• Quotations from articles published in scientific reviews and journals shall be undertaken as follows: [Author’s name in SMALL CAPS], [title of article] [name of the review or journal in italic], [volume of the review or journal, when applicable], [number of the review or journal, when applicable], [year of publication], [page or pages] Ex: SÉRVULO CORREIA, Separation of Powers and Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions in Portugal, Revista da Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Lisboa, XXXIV, 1993, pp. 87 ff.

• Quotations from articles published in collective works shall be undertaken as follows: [Author’s name in SMALL CAPS], [title of article] in [name of the collective work in italic], [volume of the collective work, when applicable], [location of publication], [year of publication], [page or pages] Ex: RUI MACHETE, A Relevância Processual dos Vícios Procedimentais no Novo Paradigma da Justiça Administrativa Portuguesa, in Estudos Jurídicos e Económicos em Homenagem ao Prof. Doutor António de Sousa Franco, III, Lisboa, 2006, pp. 851-878.

• Quotations from court decisions shall be undertaken as follows: [Decision of (Court)], [date of decision in the following order: day, month, year] in [collection of jurisprudence], [volume of the collection of jurisprudence, when applicable], [date of publication of the volume of the collection of jurisprudence], [page or pages].


a. Quotations from court decisions that are available online shall be undertaken as follows: [Decision of (Court)], [date of decision], [indication of search engine], Ex: Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court, 11.09.2013, available at http://www.dgsi.pt.
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Declaração do reviewer:
**Reviewer’s statement:**

Declaro que o autor do texto não me foi revelado. De acordo com a informação de que disponho, declaro que não existe qualquer conflito de interesse entre mim e o autor do texto apreciado.

*I hereby declare that the identity of the author of the text has not been disclosed to me. According to the information made available to me, there is no conflict of interest between me and the author of the reviewed text.*

Data: Assinatura:
Date: Signature:
Exmo/a. Senhor(a),

Dear Sir/Madam,

Muito obrigado por aceitar rever este artigo para eventual publicação na e-Pública: Revista Eletrónica de Direito Público. O seu relatório de avaliação, totalmente anónimo, será muito apreciado pelos autores e pela Comissão Editorial da Revista, revelando-se fundamental para manter os standards de exigência científica postulados pela e-Pública.

Thank you for accepting to review this article in order to assess its publishing merits in e-Pública: Revista Eletrónica de Direito Público. Your reviewer’s form, which is completely anonymous, will be much appreciated by the authors and the Editorial Board of the Journal, and is fundamental to maintain the standards of scientific demand set forth by ePública.

Nos termos dos pontos 3. e 4. das “Normas de Procedimento e Estilo da e-Pública”, o reviewer terá em conta, na avaliação do texto, a actualidade e o interesse do tema tratado, a clareza da exposição, a análise da jurisprudência e da legislação relevantes e o cumprimento das normas de estilo naquele descritas. O reviewer deverá preencher o questionário infra e pronunciar-se num de dois sentidos: (i) positivo; (ii) negativo. No último caso, o reviewer indicará, em texto não superior a 10 linhas (Avaliação Global), os aspectos a reformular no artigo.

Under Articles 3. and 4. of the “e-Pública Editorial Rulebook”, the reviewer will take into account, while reviewing the text, the interest and relevance of the topic, the clarity of the text, the analysis of relevant legislation and case law, as well as the compliance with the rules foreseen under said Rulebook. The reviewer must fill in the form set forth below and decide whether the evaluation is: (i) positive or (ii) negative. In the latter case, the reviewer shall indicate, in no more than 10 lines (Global Evaluation), which aspects must be corrected.

1. O artigo é actual e original, nomeadamente através da contribuição com elementos adicionais para a discussão da temática versada? / Is the article relevant and original, namely through its contribution to the public debate of the topic?

Sim / Yes [__]
Não / No [__]

Comentários / Comments:

2. A argumentação do autor é lógica e compreensível, com recurso a suficiente doutrina e/ou jurisprudência? / Is the author’s reasoning logical and understandable and does it encompass enough case law and legal authorities?

Sim / Yes [__]
Não / No [__]

Comentários / Comments:
3. O artigo encontra-se bem escrito, de um forma escorreita e estruturada, em cumprimento das normas de estilo da ePública? / Is the article written in a structured manner, abiding by the standards of the ePública’s Editorial Rulebook?

Sim / Yes [___]
Não / No [___]

Comentários / Comments:

4. Avaliação Global (indique apenas uma opção) / Global Evaluation (please choose only one option).

a. Recomendado para publicação sem reservas / Recommended for publishing without reservations [___]

b. Recomendado para publicação com reservas / Recommended for publishing with reservations [___]

c. Recomendado para publicação após revisão estrutural do artigo / Recommended for publishing after major amendments [___]

d. Não recomendado para publicação [___] / Not recommended for publishing [___]

Fundamentos da decisão avaliatória (em texto não superior a 10 linhas) / Grounds for the review (within 10 lines):

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

***