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About the *Ottawa Law Review*

The *Ottawa Law Review* is a bilingual academic journal published biannually by the students of the Common Law Section under the supervision of a Faculty Advisor. Since its foundation in 1966, the *Ottawa Law Review* has been devoted to excellence in legal scholarship and to the promotion of a diversity of opinion on current legal issues. The *Ottawa Law Review*’s mandate to publish articles of the highest quality has resulted in its articles being cited in decisions by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Student editorship is highly regarded within the profession and can be a great benefit to students seeking employment. For many students, working at the *Ottawa Law Review* is their first opportunity to add legal experience to their curriculum vitae. Former editors have gone on to work at Canada’s largest law firms and clerk at all levels of court.

The *Ottawa Law Review* is administered and edited entirely by students of the Faculty of Law, Common Law Section, University of Ottawa, under the supervision of a Faculty Advisor. It publishes two issues each year, and employs a rolling acceptance process—accepting submissions for each issue until completed, and then considering material for subsequent issues.
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INTRODUCTION

Our former Faculty Advisor, Professor Steven Hoffman, challenged our Senior Board to reimagine the Ottawa Law Review in the 21st century. Inspired by his challenge, we decided to conduct a comprehensive review of our processes and procedures, which resulted in publishing this paper.

Reimagining the Ottawa Law Review requires strategic thinking. Strategic intelligence, as defined by Professor John R. Wells, is “the capacity to adapt to changing circumstances, as opposed to blindly continuing on a path when all signals in your competitive environment suggest you need to change course.” For better or worse, change defines our time. Entire industries have experienced upheaval or erasure due to an unwillingness or inability to evolve—and legal publishing is not immune to these consequences.

So, what do we do? We can emulate our past practices: print paper issues, mail them to subscribers and libraries, and hope for the best. Or, we can adapt to the digital age and chart a new course for our journal. Change can be a good thing. Leveraging technology and studying changing reader habits can provide many opportunities for law journals. We can reach a wider audience, collect data, and disseminate information in new ways.

Internally, we can publish faster, work more efficiently, and lower costs. This paper is as much an internal Ottawa Law Review document as it is a platform for other student-run law journals. Annual turnovers in editorial staff plague all student-run law journals and make maintaining consistency and continuity a growing challenge. More critically, rapid turnover hinders long-term, strategic thinking. It is easier to look to the past and forget about the future. As a result, we hope that this paper will serve as a policy platform for future Editorial Boards.

Before we set out our vision for the Ottawa Law Review, we would like to thank our former Dean, Nathalie Des Rosiers, for her continued guidance and support. Furthermore, we truly appreciate the time and efforts of Professor Peter Oliver, Professor Craig Forcese, Professor Adam Dodek, Professor Steven Hoffman, and Professor Pacifique Manirakiza. Without their assistance, this report and the progress we have made would not have been possible.

Change can be a good thing.
Moving Beyond the 20th Century Model
The *Ottawa Law Review*, like many student-run law journals, has held onto the 20th century model of legal publishing. This model relies on the mailing of print issues to paid subscribers, uses inefficient editing and publishing procedures, and lacks a forum for ongoing debate within the legal community. In short, this model is no longer sustainable. We must adapt to the evolving demands of the marketplace and embrace technology. However, before we can plan for the future, we need to identify the problems associated with relying on the 20th century model.

**A. Inefficient Editing Process & Publishing Delays**

Law journals are notoriously slow at publishing. We reached out to a number of law journals in Canada and the United States, and, based on our confidential discussions, it generally takes journals six to twelve months to publish an issue. To make matters worse, the peer review process can further delay the publication of an issue. Publication delays have serious consequences: the law could change before an article reaches readers, a “pressing” issue could fade from the public’s consciousness, and the delay could adversely affect an academic’s career or undermine the reputation of the journal.

One major reason for these delays is the influence of the print model over the editing process. Law journals typically receive many submissions, accept some articles for publication, and then edit all articles simultaneously. This approach ensures that all articles in a particular issue will be ready for typeset and printing at the same time. However, if one author is late at approving edits, or if sources for one article cannot be located, then the entire issue is delayed. Furthermore, a typical law journal that follows the print model carves out a period in its editing cycles for an Editor-in-Chief to conduct a final review before sending the articles to typeset. Since the editing cycles are scheduled at specific times within the academic year, this model leaves the final reviewers with a large volume of work to complete in a short period of time.

By shifting to a digital model, we can redesign the *Ottawa Law Review*’s editing cycle to avoid delays and pace workflow more evenly.

**B. Declining Interest in Print as a Medium for Disseminating Scholarship**

For many law journals, the primary model of disseminating work involves the mailing of physical print issues to subscribers. Print demand, however, has substantially declined. Individuals, law firms, libraries, and institutions no longer want to receive print issues. Space is limited and budgets are tight. Furthermore, many readers expect to access content on demand. As a result, we must change our medium for delivering scholarship, or risk becoming obsolete.

One possible option is to rely on paid legal databases. Many law journals send their publications to pay-per-use legal databases that post the publications online. Journals receive a royalty payment each time a user downloads a publication from the database. The problem with this approach is that these databases put legal scholarship out of reach for much of the population, and even many within the profession. Relying exclusively on these databases, therefore, is not the answer. Like print issues, this platform limits who can access or engage with our product. In the 21st century, we must pivot away from print and paid-access legal databases to an open access, digital model to disseminate our work to a larger audience.
C. Lack of Dialogue Between Readers and Authors

The 20th century model does not foster dialogue because it involves a slow publishing process, which hinders timely critiques or responses to articles. If a person wants to respond to an article, that advocates for environmental law reform or proposes a modified test for causation, for example, the timeframe for printing such a response is too long. This limitation stifles dialogue and prevents the growth of the law. The 21st century platform provides for greater discussion, and specifically allows our readers to better engage with published material.

D. Inability to Identify the Target Audience

For generalist law journals, such as the Ottawa Law Review, the 20th century model makes it impossible to identify a target audience. This failure to identify the target audience means that we publish everything for everyone. We operate under an assumption that our readers are interested in every article, despite the reality that each article will only be of interest to a specific audience. This model exposes a major marketing flaw because most readers have specialized, narrow interests and often seek out publications on those bases. The 21st century model gives readers the opportunity to seek out individual articles that are of interest to them. It also provides the opportunity to target certain groups and individuals.
Four Guiding Principles for the Ottawa Law Review in the 21st Century

The Ottawa Law Review must respond to the evolving needs of the legal profession and legal scholarship. Technological innovations and changing reader expectations have disrupted our current publishing model. Our response to this disruption should be informed by re-examining our purpose, goals, and vision in a broader context. We are sensitive to our tradition and history. But, we must also look forward. It is not enough to spot issues and present recommendations. We must broadly regroup and reset our vision for the Ottawa Law Review in the digital age. Moreover, we must create an overarching framework that can guide future Editorial Boards in the transition toward a 21st century model.

We have established four guiding principles for future Editorial Boards of the Ottawa Law Review to consider as we bring our journal into the 21st century.
First, we will work more efficiently. We should leverage technology and redistribute our efforts to accelerate the Ottawa Law Review's peer review, editing, and publication processes. Recent experience demonstrates that the publication of legal scholarship in tandem with policy discussions and legal developments can shape public conversation. For example, when Kent Roach and Craig Forcese published "real-time scholarship" in response to Canada's anti-terrorism legislation (Bill C-51) in 2015, their work pushed the issue into the public spotlight and forced lawmakers to respond. Working efficiently will also keep our journal top of mind for legal scholars. It will give the Ottawa Law Review a competitive advantage over other legal journals, as the publishing process would take less time than many other journals.

Second, we will publish accessible scholarship. The Ottawa Law Review will become accessible in terms of its platform and content. Relying exclusively on a subscription-based medium is no longer appropriate. A person's ability to pay, or proximity to an institution that subscribes to our publication, should not dictate who can read our material. We will also strive to publish scholarship that contains accessible language for an interdisciplinary audience and new forms of content to reach a broader audience.

Third, we will create a forum for dialogue. 21st century law journals should push the law forward. In addition to publishing high-quality legal scholarship, we will give readers the opportunity to fully engage with that scholarship. When we publish an article, we should invite our readers to respond, comment, or present alternative perspectives. In short, we will use social media to create a marketplace of ideas.

Fourth, we will strive to become a “solutions-oriented” legal journal. When we receive a submission for publication, the Editorial Board will expressly consider whether the publication provides a solution to the issue or problem identified in the article. This “solutions-oriented” approach is important for three reasons. First, for a generalist law journal that publishes a wide variety of content, having a common theme unifying each article provides necessary coherence. Second, solutions-oriented content will appeal to a more diverse readership, including: policymakers, lawmakers, legal professionals, interdisciplinary specialists, and members of the interested public. Third, the evaluation of whether an article is solutions-oriented puts an added onus on our Editorial Board and our contributors. It forces both parties to consider the purpose behind the article and the article's contribution to the legal profession, academia, or the general public. We will continue to publish content that is relevant, timely, and has clear takeaways time than many other journals.
The Way Forward: Bringing the Ottawa Law Review into the 21st Century

The 20th century model is no longer a viable platform for law journals, but many still rely on it. We have identified some problems with the 20th century model of legal publishing and outlined the Ottawa Law Review’s four guiding principles for the 21st century. The following section outlines how we can bring our journal into the 21st century.
Making the Editing Process more Efficient

The *Ottawa Law Review* will seek to publish more efficiently. In fact, this will become our key value-added element and distinguish our journal from others. Many legal scholars view student-run law journals as inefficient and, therefore, seek to publish their work with faculty-run law journals or specialized commercial journals. As a result, we need to change how we operate and gain credibility as an efficient legal journal.

Timing is everything. Laws change. There could be a substantial risk of an author’s work being superseded by legislative change or an appeal. Alternatively, something that is particularly timely or topical at the time of submission may fade from the public consciousness once it is finally published. As a result, we need to look inwards and re-evaluate our processes to ensure that we are working as efficiently as possible. We also need to ensure that we are making full use of available technology to modernize how we work.

### i. Staggering Editing Cycle Start Times

Like many law journals, the *Ottawa Law Review* accepts articles for submission on a rolling basis, but edits those same articles in fixed, scheduled cycles. This approach is a relic of the print model where, as mentioned above, all articles are edited together to ensure that an entire issue is ready for publication at the same time. This approach causes significant delays.

An open access model allows journals to post an article on their websites as soon as the article is typeset. As a result, the *Ottawa Law Review* should start staggering the start times of each editing cycle or edit on a rolling basis. For example, two articles could enter the editing cycle each week. A staggered model allows an efficient allocation of workload for the editors throughout the editing cycles, allowing them to work on smaller chunks of edits every few weeks, rather than one large chunk that they must edit in one week. This approach gives more time to the Editors-in-Chief to conduct their final reviews before sending the article to typeset. As a result the editing cycle will run more efficiently, without unnecessary delays.
ii. On-Call Expert Peer-Reviewers

To increase our efficiency, we need to improve our peer-review process. Currently, peer-reviewers who volunteer their time and their contributions are not acknowledged, so as to protect their anonymity. Often, it is difficult to find an assessor who is either willing or able to conduct an assessment, especially when the article is written about a niche area of the law. Generally, peer-reviewers are not incentivized to perform assessments.⁴

So, how can we incentivize independent assessors to perform this critical function? There are two primary ways. First, we could compensate independent assessors for each assessment they provide. The sum should be nominal, but it would both professionalize the relationship and compensate assessors for their time. Such compensation will convey our appreciation for the assessor’s contribution. Second, we can provide an intangible benefit in the form of an esteemed designation. A number of studies about the independent peer-review system suggest that assessors are motivated if they receive a position title.⁵ For example, one study suggests that the majority of peer-reviewers would be encouraged to review articles if they were appointed to a journal’s Editorial Board.⁶

The Ottawa Law Review should consider both options. Given the current state of our finances, we will pay a nominal fee to our reviewers. Additionally, we will also develop an Ottawa Law Review Expert Advisory Panel, and provide independent assessors with the title of “Ottawa Law Review Expert Assessor” in exchange for the articles that they assess for our journal. We will also formally recognize these Expert Assessors in our journal masthead and on our website. To ensure anonymity, however, we will not post the names of the Expert Assessors until we have a substantial number of assessors. This way the authors will not be able to deduce who peer-reviewed their submissions.

iii. Reallocating Human Power

The Ottawa Law Review should re-examine how we assign work given to our student editors. Specialization of editing responsibility provides an opportunity to increase efficiency. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Editors</td>
<td>(first-year law students) should be tasked exclusively with locating and scanning sources, and ensuring that the propositions cited in the publication are true and accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Editors</td>
<td>(second-year law students) should be assigned to edit footnotes and the text of an article in teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Editors</td>
<td>(third-year law students) should review the editing work of the first-year and second-year law students to ensure that the entire article is coherent, well-edited, and cite-checked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors-in-Chief</td>
<td>should conduct a final approval of the article before sending it to typeset.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iv. Communicating Regularly with Authors

We need to better communicate with our authors. The most effective way to do this is to send regular, timely correspondence after each milestone in the editing process: starting with the author’s submission and ending when the article is published.

There are three benefits to this approach. First, it assures the author that the article will be published on time and provides a greater degree of certainty about when the article will be published. Second, regular correspondence promotes accountability—it reminds the journal and its editors that someone is waiting for their work to be completed. Third, communication after each milestone ensures that issues are flagged and promptly remedied. For example, if a first-year editor determines during the first editing stage that a quotation is not in fact attributable to the third footnote, that issue could be raised with the author at the end of the first editing cycle. This approach will ensure that all substantive issues are addressed throughout the cycle, not at the very end.

v. Leveraging Technology

The Ottawa Law Review should leverage technology to make the editing process more efficient. There are web platforms that are specifically designed for legal journals, like Scholastica or ExpressO. These platforms allow editors to conduct all edits on a single platform, in addition to communicating with authors and independent assessors. Furthermore, other applications can streamline the scanning process that is used to confirm the accuracy of every proposition cited in each article. Today, most students own smartphones. By encouraging editors to use smartphone scanner applications to complete their source verification scans, the editing process will be simplified.
Shifting from a Print Model to a Digital Model

As described above, the 20th century model relies on publishing content primarily in print form, with digital copies available exclusively through pay-per-use legal databases. This model is no longer sustainable. As a result, the Ottawa Law Review has shifted to a digital model in the 2016–2017 academic year. We are confident that a digital model will make our publications more accessible, increase our readership, make our journal more efficient, and result in greater administrative efficiency.

i. Accessibility & Increased Readership

Anyone should be able to read our publications; thus, shifting to an open-access digital model eliminates barriers to accessing our scholarship. Our website now features every publication published by our journal since its founding in 1966. We encourage all law journals to similarly open their scholarship to the general public. Given the general public’s wide access to the Internet, this digital model also allows the Ottawa Law Review to reach new audiences and target specific groups that may be interested in a particular article.

ii. Faster Publishing

The 20th century law review model publishes material in instalments. An entire issue is sent to the publisher for print once every article in the issue is edited and ready for typeset. This process creates significant delays in getting articles to readers who are accustomed to receiving information “in real time.”

A key recommendation to improve efficiency is to eliminate the concept of “issues” altogether. An open-access digital model allows journals to post articles online as soon as they are ready, which gives readers access to a constant flow of timely material. Furthermore, leading scholars have indicated that they want their work to be published as quickly as possible. Shifting to an open-access model, together with changing the editing cycle, will lead to quicker publishing timelines.
iii. Cost & Administrative Efficiency

As the demand for print declines, the Ottawa Law Review generates ever-dwindling revenues from traditional publishing. What’s more, publishing paper volumes is increasingly costly: smaller print runs make it difficult to achieve any significant economies of scale; print readership is difficult to forecast and often over-estimated; and back-and-forth discussions with print subscribers distract our editors from publishing legal scholarship. The overall effect is that we print each issue at a loss.

Shifting from a traditional print model towards a digital model provides an opportunity for the Ottawa Law Review to significantly reduce costs and improve administrative efficiency. However, we recognize that some subscribers will still prefer to receive a print issue. On-demand printing presents a compromise. Recently, the Ottawa Law Review collaborated with a publisher that has the capacity to print on-demand. Moreover, our publisher will accept payment directly from our subscribers, print the issue, ship the issue, and remit any profits to the Ottawa Law Review on a quarterly basis. This change means that our journal will no longer need to expend our efforts on collecting payment, mailing invoices, and coordinating shipment. For the Ottawa Law Review, we will save future costs on each print run by implementing an on-demand print model.

There is concern that freely-accessible publications are less authoritative, making the publication’s brand less prestigious. In response, we contend that the quality of a law journal’s content is independent of its publication medium. Whether articles are published in print or online, our Editorial Board continues to ensure peer-review, cite-check, and proofread every article. In addition, we are confident that scholars will be more inclined to publish with our journal if their work can be accessed by a wider population.
Multi-Media

The *Ottawa Law Review* should find different ways to engage with our audience. Different forms of multimedia, like podcasts or video, will allow our journal to reach a broader audience and make content more accessible.

I. Podcasts

Historically, the *Ottawa Law Review* publishes interviews with distinguished jurists or legal professionals. We have interviewed esteemed legal figures such as the Honourable Justice Louise Arbour, C.C., G.O.Q., and the Honourable Justice Ian Binnie, C.C., Q.C. Our editors conduct and transcribe the interviews, add footnotes where necessary, and then edit the written interviews before sending them for typeset.

However, reader habits have evolved in the digital age. Moreover, new media provide the opportunity to conduct interviews in innovative ways. Some law reviews, such as the *UCLA Law Review* and *McGill Law Journal*, have started to conduct podcast interviews or lectures instead of publishing transcribed versions of the same. Going forward, the *Ottawa Law Review* should consider conducting monthly podcast interviews. These podcasts would allow authors to discuss their findings and proposals, with the ultimate goal of driving interest in the forthcoming publication. Podcasts are also easier and quicker to conduct than a written, published interview. In addition, we could conduct shorter interviews that will be published in our journal. The *Ottawa Law Review* could reach out to experts for comment after a controversial decision from a court is released, or upon a noteworthy legal development, and post that interview online within days or weeks of the decision or development.

II. Video Recordings

The *Ottawa Law Review* is a vendor in the marketplace of ideas. When that marketplace changes or evolves, we need to keep up. By putting more of an emphasis on new forms of communication, such as video, we will allow our journal to reach a broader audience.

First, any event that we host should be live-streamed for the general public. Events should not only be available for those who are able to attend in person, but also for those around the world who may be interested in the event, but are unable to attend it. Second, when we host a symposium or lecture, we should record the event and post the recording online for any interested viewers. Recently, the *Ottawa Law Review* hosted its 2016 Symposium called “Drugs for Superbugs: Fighting Antibiotic Resistance in Canada.” We live-streamed the event for the general public and posted the videos on our YouTube page, making it widely accessible for those who were not able to attend the event.

Journals can also leverage video recordings to promote individual publications. For example, *The University of Toronto Faculty of Law Journal* invites authors to produce video abstracts, introductions, or updates about their articles or research. This interactive approach is a game-changer. It gives authors the ability to engage with their readers in new ways and, ultimately, may drive readership for the journal.
Social Media

Social media has developed rapidly and has ushered in changes concerning how people interact and share information. Law reviews are still catching up with this new reality. As the use of printed law reviews has declined, digital and online access to information has increased. Law reviews can leverage this by using social media to attract readers to their articles, increasing their impact. The Ottawa Law Review will increase its reach and impact by leveraging social media. We need to use Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn to better engage with readers, make our scholarship more accessible, and encourage dialogue.

What’s more, legal professionals have a substantial social media presence. As legal professionals continue to turn to social media, we need to create a stronger presence on these same forums to better connect with our audience.

The Ottawa Law Review has started to use social media to increase our journal’s reach. Starting in 2016, when we accept an article for publication, we immediately post the article on social media as a Working Series Paper. After the article is published, we post links to the article on social media to reach the broadest possible audience by tagging the author, the author’s home institution, and relevant institutions or organizations that may be interested in the article.

Going forward, we should ask authors to play a greater role in promoting their articles. It should be a two-way street. For example, we should ask authors to submit a 140-character Tweet, which summarizes their article when they submit the article for consideration. If the article is accepted for publication, the journal should then post that Tweet to their Twitter account and ask the author to do the same. Both the journal, and the author, should take part in promoting the article through social media.

The Ottawa Law Review should also promote each notable mention of a published law review article. Posting this information on social media will grow our brand, and demonstrate the real impact of our publication. We should also resurrect past articles and publications, which would be of interest to the legal and academic community. For example, in 2016, the Ottawa Law Review started its “Flashback Friday” series, where we posted links biweekly to past articles or interviews. Recently, we posted a 2013 interview with the Honourable Justice Suzanne Côté, conducted by the Ottawa Law Review before her eventual appointment to the Supreme Court of Canada.
Continuity and Innovation

Rapid turnover of Editorial Boards at the Ottawa Law Review makes long-term, strategic planning very difficult. The effects are significant. Internal processes are rarely re-examined to identify areas for improvement. In addition, continuous turnover results in a loss of institutional memory. The Ottawa Law Review proposes five solutions to this problem: conducting audits, measuring reader engagement, prioritizing long-term planning, building networks, and learning from other disciplines at the University of Ottawa.

i. Conducting Audits

The Ottawa Law Review Editorial Board should proceed with biannual internal audits to spot issues and bottlenecks, in addition to identifying best practices and opportunities for improvement. Measurable metrics should be analyzed regularly and progress reports passed along to future Editorial Boards for follow-up.

ii. Measuring Reader Engagement

Measuring reader engagement is particularly important for the Ottawa Law Review. It provides the opportunity to measure our reach and impact. Today, society prioritizes objective measures. The most effective metric for measuring legal scholarship is to track the amount of article downloads and citations. A 2006 study by a group of professors from New York University, Georgetown, and University of Carolina suggests that citation counts are a respectable proxy for article quality and provide a meaningful indication of the influence that an article has on the development of legal thought.

If we track this information internally, we will have a better view of the impact of our articles. In an effort to attract other readers, and to demonstrate the impact of our publication, we should follow The University of Toronto Faculty of Law Journal's lead and post a list of instances where the Supreme Court of Canada, appellate courts, and trial level courts have cited our journal. In addition, we should track how often each article is downloaded. The Osgoode Hall Law Journal and The Western Journal of Legal Studies features a global readership map on their websites which tracks these metrics. This information will provide information about our readers and our content. We can then use this data to plan for the future.
iii. Long-Term Planning

The Ottawa Law Review should create a long-term plan that aligns with our publication’s vision and guiding principles for the future. Editorial Boards should continuously reflect on the purpose of our publication, the competitive environment in which it operates, our target audience, our business model, the state of our finances, and the authors we hope to attract. It is important for Editorial Boards to regularly revisit this long-term plan to ensure that the journal is heading in the right direction.

iv. Building Networks

Student-run law journals are generally afflicted by the same issues: declining print subscribers, competition from faculty-run or commercial law journals, and a push for accessible scholarship. In an effort to foster cooperation and open dialogue, the Ottawa Law Review should endeavour to work more harmoniously with other student-run law reviews. For example, future Editorial Boards could organize an annual virtual or in-person meeting to discuss common issues and foster collaboration.

v. Learning From Other Disciplines

The Ottawa Law Review should learn from other disciplines, faculties, and departments at the University of Ottawa. For example, the Ottawa Law Review should recruit business, communications, and computer science students to study our model and overall structure, and to propose recommendations and opportunities for improvement. We are very good at editing legal scholarship; but we may not have all the answers to other issues. For instance: How can we, most efficiently coordinate approximately 90 student editors? How can the user experience be improved on our website? How can we strengthen our social media presence? Or, how can we better target our end users?

Future Editorial Boards of the Ottawa Law Review could develop an annual competition and invite students from other faculties and departments to study what we do and to provide a report with recommendations. To reward the students for their work, the teams that provide the best three reports could receive an honorarium and acknowledgments on our website and social media platforms. We need to break down the barriers between faculties at our university and appreciate that we have much to learn from our colleagues.
Conclusion

Times are changing; we need to think strategically and plan for the future. This report sets out four guiding principles for the future of our journal and specific recommendations to fully bring us into the 21st century. We hope that this report will inspire future Editorial Boards at the Ottawa Law Review and elsewhere to be strategic and to “think big” over the coming years. Strategic thinking will bring our journal to the forefront of legal scholarship and allows us to become a premier resource for legal minds.
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