

---

# Panel Discussion: How do Law Reviews Contribute to the Development of Law?

---

## *Preface*

On April 18, 2025, an event was held to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the Baku State University Law Review. The event aimed to highlight the achievements of the Law Review over the past ten years and to discuss its future directions.

During the event, individuals who had supported the activities of the Law Review, including the founding Editor-in-Chief, Orkhan Abdulkarimli, delivered speeches and shared their valuable insights and recommendations.

Subsequently, a panel discussion titled “How Do Law Reviews Contribute to the Development of Law?” was held. The discussion, moderated by the current Editor-in-Chief, Jamal Azimov, featured the participation of former Editors-in-Chief and editors of the Law Review.

It should be noted that this discussion could also have been organised with the participation of the Law Review’s experienced authors.

However, it was considered that, for such a topic, gathering the perspectives of editors who are closely familiar with the Review’s activities would ensure a broader and more comprehensive viewpoint.

## *Ön söz*

18 aprel 2025-ci il tarixində Bakı Dövlət Universiteti Tələbə Hüquq Jurnalının 10 illik yubileyinə həsr olunmuş tədbir keçirilmişdir. Tədbir Jurnalın ötən 10 ildə əldə etdiyi nailiyyətləri qeyd etmək və onun gələcək fəaliyyət istiqamətlərini müzakirə etmək məqsədi daşmışdır.

Tədbirin gedişatında Jurnalın fəaliyyətinə dəstək göstərmiş şəxslər, o cümlədən qurucu baş redaktor Orxan Abdulkərimli çıxış edərək dəyərli fikir və tövsiyələrini bölüşmüşlər.

Növbəti hissədə isə “Hüquq jurnalları hüququn inkişafına necə töhfə verir?” mövzusunda panel müzakirə baş tutmuşdur. Jurnalın cari baş redaktoru Camal Əzimovun moderatorluğu ilə keçirilən müzakirədə Jurnalın əvvəlki Baş redaktor və redaktorları iştirak etmişlər. Qeyd edilməlidir ki, bu müzakirə Jurnalın təcrübəli müəlliflərinin iştirakı ilə də qurula bilərdi, lakin düşünürük ki, belə bir mövzuda məhz Jurnal fəaliyyəti ilə yaxından tanış olan redaktorların mövqelərini öyrənmək daha geniş perspektivin təmin olunmasına gətirib çıxaracaqdır.

**Participants:**

***Jamal Azimov***, moderator

*Editor-in-Chief of the Baku State University Law Review*

***Rufat Naghiyev***

*Lawyer at the Innovation and Digital Development Agency under the Ministry of  
Digital Development and Transport*

*Editor-in-Chief of Volume 9 of the Baku State University Law Review*

***Elvin Isayev***

*Senior Lawyer at "Azersilah" CJSCo*

*Editor-in-Chief of Volume 5 of the Baku State University Law Review*

***Ilham Zulfugarli***

*Senior Investigator of the Khazar District Prosecutor's Office*

*Editor of Volume 9 of the Baku State University Law Review*

***Mansur Samadov***

*Chairman of the Student Academic Society of Baku State University Law School*

*Editor-in-Chief of Volume 10 of the Baku State University Law Review*

**Jamal Azimov:** We will have discussions on the topic “*How Do Law Reviews Contribute to the Development of Law?*”. In the first part of our two-part discussions, we will address issues on the international level, and in the second part, we will focus on matters within the Azerbaijani context. I believe that if we are speaking about contributing to the development of law, we must first clarify what we mean by contribution: is it a contribution to the academic environment, to legislation, or to legal policy? Let’s begin with you, Rufat.

**Rufat Naghiyev:** Thank you. In my opinion, from an international perspective, it is important to first highlight the contribution of law reviews to the academic community. Researchers, doctoral candidates, and students often begin by publishing several articles on their chosen topics before eventually preparing their dissertations based on these articles. The key point is that authors turn to law reviews both to engage in scholarly discussions and to “formalize” their research findings. In this regard, I highly value the contribution of law reviews to the development of the academic environment.

**Jamal Azimov:** Thank you, Rufat. Ilham, you were the editor of the Law Review from 2014 to 2016, and now it’s been about 10 years since that time. Based on your experience from 10 years ago, how would you answer this question?

**Ilham Zulfugarli:** That’s a very good question, thank you. If you had asked me this question 10 years ago, I would have answered it quite differently. In general, a law review is, after all, a scientific journal. In order to expect development from a journal, one must first work toward its advancement. We read about the scientific revolutions that took place in the 19th and 20th centuries. If we delve a little deeper, we can see that debates based on scientific articles occurred not only in law, but also in mathematics, physics, and other scientific fields, through journals, newspapers, and other printed publications. For example, in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century— a dynamic period for intellectual exchange, scientists like Einstein and Tesla would formulate a thesis, publish it in a journal, and shortly after, another scientist would refute it with a different article presenting a counterargument.<sup>1</sup>

In my opinion, even the smallest advancement in a journal can be considered a contribution. The key factors here are time, place, and existing conditions. It is possible that the articles selected for publication at a certain

---

<sup>1</sup> The article “*Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?*” by Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen was published in the Physical Review journal. A few months after this event, Niels Bohr published his counter-argument article, bearing the same title, in the same journal. In this way, the scientific environment was formed. See Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, Nathan Rosen, *Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?*, 47 Physical Review 777 (1935); Niels Bohr, *Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?*, 48 Physical Review 696 (1935).

time may not address topics that seem particularly relevant or important at that moment; however, as time passes, all fields evolve, and circumstances may arise where those topics become top priorities. When future researchers examine these matters, they may find that the first seeds of the topic were reflected in earlier articles and journals. Just as people accumulate capital to ensure a better life for future generations, these journals also serve as a kind of legacy. Just as today's literature often refers to the ideas of ancient Roman jurists, future generations will likewise be able to use the articles published in these journals as valuable sources.

**Jamal Azimov:** Thank you, Ilham. As you emphasised, academic discussions were once conducted largely through journals. Today, there is no unanimous stance on the idea that "*academic articles should be solely for academia,*" and it remains an open topic for discussion. Some people support the view that there is no need for non-lawyers to understand legal articles when reading them. Others believe that the language of academic legal articles is becoming increasingly complex, making it harder for non-lawyers to understand their content. Elvin, what do you think — which approach is more appropriate?

**Elvin Isayev:** First of all, I would like to thank the Student Academic Society for the invitation. Regarding the question, I believe that journals bring together several different categories of people: authors, readers, and the editorial board. Let us first consider the relationship between authors and readers: when an author writes an article, they determine both the topic and the target audience. For example, an author may decide to write on a topic that would primarily attract the interest of highly specialised academic experts.

Alternatively, they may write an article addressing an issue that concerns the daily problems of the general public. From this perspective, whether an academic article is simple or complex depends on the author and the audience they have chosen. If an author aims to target the general public but still uses heavy and complicated expressions in the article, it will not be successful — at least, it will not effectively reach the intended audience.

**Jamal Azimov:** Thank you very much for your thoughts. Mansur, do you have anything to add?

**Mansur Samadov:** Thank you. I will try to answer this question from a student's perspective. I believe that both law reviews and articles should be written in a way that is understandable not just for law students but also for non-lawyers. For example, even a student studying in the Faculty of Mathematics should be able to understand a legal article when reading it. Personally, I comprehend articles written in simple language much better, and I think other students would agree with me. One of our goals as the Law

Review is to increase legal literacy, so the articles we publish aim to address not only the legal academy but also Azerbaijani society and the international sphere.

**Jamal Azimov:** Thank you very much, Mansur. My final question on this topic is addressed to Rufat. Rufat, when I read your recently published article in our Law Review, I noticed that it concerns artificial intelligence and the ethical conduct of advocates.<sup>2</sup> Upon reading it, I realised that it is written in an incredibly simple language that even a non-lawyer could easily understand. After all, subjects like artificial intelligence are generally of a more complex nature and therefore arguably require a proportionally sophisticated style. What is your perspective?

**Rufat Naghiyev:** This, of course, depends somewhat on the author's choice. For instance, in my own writing experience, although part of the article discussed the practice in the United States, I deliberately set out to write the article in Azerbaijani. I intentionally used clear and straightforward sentences that everyone could understand, without unnecessary complexity, in order to form a coherent understanding of artificial intelligence, a new trend that has also become widespread within Azerbaijani society. Sometimes, academic articles employ convoluted sentences or complex vocabulary. However, I sought to avoid this as much as possible and aimed to write the article in Azerbaijani.

This approach corresponds with broader discussions in legal scholarship regarding accessibility. Excessive complexity in academic legal writing can obscure meaning and limit the reach of scholarly work, as well as cause time-wasting for readers to understand.<sup>3</sup> For that reason, modern academic standards increasingly encourage the use of plain language to decrease the difficulties faced by the readers in understanding. The researcher advocates for a clear and precise writing style, particularly in areas where broad comprehension is essential. Since artificial intelligence has become an accessible tool for almost everyone, access to information on this subject should likewise be available to all.

**Jamal Azimov:** Understood, thank you very much, Rufat. You also mentioned the issue of accessibility. Mansur pointed out that as academic journals, one of our objectives is to contribute to legal education. Rufat

---

<sup>2</sup> See RUFƏT NAĞIYEV, *Vəkilin süni intellektli köməkçisi və peşə davranış qaydaları: Azərbaycan və ABŞ qanunvericiliyinin müqayisəli təhlili* [Lawyer's Artificial Intelligence Assistant and Rules of Professional Conduct: Comparative analysis of Azerbaijani and US Legislation], 10 Baku State University 121 (2024). Available at: <https://bsulawreview.org/en/buraxilis-10/buraxilis-101/vəkilin-suni-intellektli-koməkcisi-və-pesədavranis-qaydalari-azərbaycan-və-absqanunvericiliyinin-muqayisəli-təhlili/> (last visited Apr. 29, 2025).

<sup>3</sup> Cüneyt Demir, *The Needless Complexity in Academic Writing: Simplicity vs. Flowery Language*, 19 The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal 13, 25 (2019).

similarly noted that information is now widely accessible. We also observe that most legal scholars now publish their articles and writings on open-access platforms. In a context where there is such an abundance of accessible information and publication opportunities, why do we still need journals? After all, a professor could publish an article on LinkedIn and perhaps present even higher-quality ideas than those found in journal articles. I would like the person with the most experience, Ilham, to respond to this question.

**Ilham Zulfugarli:** Thank you. It is indeed a thought-provoking question. Today, internet platforms have spread rapidly and are accessible to almost everyone. It is practically impossible to imagine life without a Wi-Fi network. Nevertheless, despite this widespread access, academic journals continue to maintain their distinctive character within the intellectual ecosystem. If we are committed to professionalism, we must consider that there is no organised, collective publication of articles scattered across various individual platforms or statuses.

Here we should apply economic reasoning. What is an article? It is an economic product, a product of an author's intellect. Why are products created? From an economic perspective, they are created for sale. However, in the realm of science, the primary goal is not to profit from the sale of the product but to contribute to its development. Product sales are based on supply and demand. Journals play a critical role in structuring this intellectual market. Just as lawyers, we consult a compilation or a code to more quickly find necessary information, researchers and practitioners who seek knowledge can more effectively obtain results by consulting journals. It serves their interest, and they do not disregard the writings; rather, they view them as a necessity. Therefore, journals must identify these needs and publish topics that contribute to the development of the field.

**Jamal Azimov:** Understood, thank you very much, Ilham. Does anyone have anything to add on this matter?

**Elvin Isayev:** In fact, I would like to highlight two factors. One of these was mentioned by Ilham, namely the marketing aspect. As a second factor, I would like to draw attention to reliability. What do we mean by reliability in this context? For example, I consider it more reliable to read an article that has undergone peer review, editorial processing, and revisions based on feedback from other reviewers, rather than an article shared by someone on a social media platform or published on a personally created website. The reason is that a peer-reviewed article is not merely a reflection of a single individual's ideas; it is a product shaped through rigorous evaluation and collective academic scrutiny. As emphasised in scholarly discussions, academic journals not only disseminate knowledge but also uphold standards of quality control

through peer review and editorial oversight.<sup>4</sup> This process substantially enhances its credibility.

Moving back to the marketing side, I believe that even though an author's main objective may be to contribute to the advancement of science, their motivation also includes the desire for their article to be read. The increase in readership stems from several factors. One scenario is where you search for the author's name within a journal to see which new topics they have addressed. Another scenario is where the journal itself has such a strong reputation that you trust the journal and search within it to find out which authors are featured. In other words, you recognise the author because of the journal. In this regard, I believe the importance of journals still remains and will continue in the future, at least for the two reasons I have mentioned: reliability and recognition.

**Jamal Azimov:** Thank you very much. I hope that the journal's activities will continue in the coming years. We also touched upon another point, namely that authors often want their articles to be read. For this reason, they sometimes choose topics that are new or likely to attract attention. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, a large proportion of academic research was devoted to COVID-19. In recent years, there has also been a considerable number of articles on artificial intelligence, particularly concerning its legal regulation. How do such articles impact the development of academia? More broadly, should academic research follow trends? From what I understand, the period of both COVID-19 and the rise of artificial intelligence coincided with Mansur's tenure as editor-in-chief. Mansur, what is your view? Do you think academic research should follow trends?

**Mansur Samadov:** This is a very interesting question. We also discussed this issue extensively among ourselves. I served as editor-in-chief during the 10th Volume, which corresponded roughly to the years 2023–2024. It was during this time that artificial intelligence became very popular. It is no coincidence that two articles on artificial intelligence, specifically about ChatGPT, were published in the second issue of the 10th Volume.<sup>5</sup> I had read a study on this topic, which showed that during the COVID-19 pandemic, a large portion of research was related to the pandemic.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Nikita Paliya & Shiva Shankar Jha, *Quality Indicators for Academic Journals: What Makes a Journal Trustworthy*, 10 IP Indian Journal of Anatomy and Surgery of Head, Neck and Brain 83, 91 (2024).

<sup>5</sup> See Nağiyev, *supra* note 2; Kanan Naghiyev, *ChatGPT from a Data Protection Perspective*, 10 Baku State University Law Review 1 (2024). Available at: <https://bsulawreview.org/en/volume-10/volume-101/chatgpt-from-a-data-protectionperspective/> (last visited Apr. 29, 2025).

<sup>6</sup> It was revealed that, during the pandemic, about 48% and 37% of all research papers on respectively Scopus and Web of Science were dedicated to Covid-19. *See*

In my opinion, this is not a very successful trend. Articles written based on trends are products intended for a very short lifespan. Accordingly, we can say that such articles lose their relevance once the specific trend, such as the pandemic, comes to an end. If we do not expect our article to remain relevant for at least the next five years, it may not even be worth publishing. In academic publishing, sustainability of relevance is a critical indicator of the quality and value of research. In my view, the most successful article is the one that remains relevant over a long period. Therefore, we should not always write about trends. Rather, we should sometimes create relevance ourselves by addressing issues outside of current trends.

**Jamal Azimov:** This is a very interesting approach. It seems to me that the point Mansur raised is particularly relevant to Rufat Naghiyev since you recently wrote an article on artificial intelligence. Do you share Mansur's view? Was your article also intended to be short-lived?

**Rufat Naghiyev:** When OpenAI introduced ChatGPT in November 2022, articles on this topic slowly began to emerge. At that time, ChatGPT, as a model, was not yet highly developed, so its sentence structures and patterns were still quite evident and distinguishable. However, as the model developed, the academic community's concerns also increased because of the emergence of plagiarism cases and the use of ChatGPT and other AI tools in article writing. The problem got so bad that recently, articles that were unmistakably created by ChatGPT were found in the databases of Elsevier and Scopus. This triggered serious alarm within the academic community.<sup>7</sup> As a result, the publisher Elsevier had to update its editorial policies to emphasise transparency regarding the use of generative AI tools, as noted in its 2023 statement on publishing ethics.<sup>8</sup>

As for the matter of trends, it largely depends on the author's objectives. For instance, if an author writes an article about the COVID-19 pandemic, it may be considered innovative and useful for only a few years, during which time relevant legislation may change. However, after losing immediate relevance, such an article may regain its significance later. For example, in the context of COVID-19, it is possible that 20, 30, or even 50 years from now, in the event of a new pandemic, articles discussing how quarantine legislation

---

Jaime A. Teixeira da Silva, Panagiotis Tsigaris & Mohammadamin Erfanmanesh, *Publishing Volumes in Major Databases Related to Covid-19*, 126 *Scientometrics* 831 (2021).

<sup>7</sup> The Latest "Crisis" — Is the Research Literature Overrun with ChatGPT- and LLM-generated Articles? (2024), [https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2024/03/20/the-latest-crisis-is-the-research-literature-overrun-with-chatgpt-and-llm-generated-articles/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2024/03/20/the-latest-crisis-is-the-research-literature-overrun-with-chatgpt-and-llm-generated-articles/?utm_source=chatgpt.com) (last visited Apr. 29, 2025).

<sup>8</sup> See Elsevier, *Publishing ethics* (2023), <https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies-and-standards/publishing-ethics#0-publishing-ethics> (last visited Apr. 29, 2025).

was implemented could once again become highly relevant. This logic applies analogously to other topics as well.

*Jamal Azimov:* Since we are discussing articles written about artificial intelligence, we must also address articles produced by means of artificial intelligence. One of the major challenges currently faced by editorial boards is articles generated through artificial intelligence. In general, how should journals approach this issue? Why should, or should not, articles produced with the help of artificial intelligence be considered a violation of academic ethics? I would like Elvin to respond to this question.

*Elvin Isayev:* This issue may vary depending on the journal's editorial policy. If an article written with the help of artificial intelligence is presented as such, there might not be a significant problem. If the journal publishes an article created through artificial intelligence and clearly indicates that the article was authored with the support of artificial intelligence, then, in my view, this would not constitute a serious ethical violation. At the very least, the reader is not misled, and no breach of ethics occurs.

However, from a legal standpoint, a more complex issue arises. From a formal perspective, an article must have an author. Current intellectual property frameworks were developed on the assumption that authors are natural persons.<sup>9</sup> Although those instruments do not explicitly control AI-generated works, the general agreement among law scholars is that authorship would presume an intellectual work by the human mind. The World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) noted in its recent discussion that whether AI systems could be considered as having authorship rights or not is still open and a subject of international debate.<sup>10</sup>

Here, a question arises: who can claim authorship rights over an article written by artificial intelligence? The artificial intelligence itself? However, artificial intelligence cannot be an author, as it does not yet fall within the concept of a legal person. In that case, who should be considered the author? Should it be the person who provided the data, the source, or the topic of the artificial intelligence? If a person merely provides prompts or topics to an AI system, can they rightfully be considered the author? Or does true authorship require deeper intellectual engagement and creativity?

Furthermore, we may consider whether artificial intelligence had any intellectual process that would allow it to claim authorship rights over the article. After all, it does not engage in original thought processes: It just recombines existing data patterns without genuine creativity or critical

---

<sup>9</sup> See Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (1886). Available at: <https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%20828/volume-828-I-11850-English.pdf> (last visited Apr. 29, 2025).

<sup>10</sup> See WIPO, *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: An Economic Perspective*, No. 77/2024 (2024).

reflection. It merely selects sources and presents topics. From this perspective, the matter could be approached as a potential ethical violation. Articles written solely through the use of artificial intelligence or those shared with a note indicating they were prepared with the assistance of artificial intelligence might be acceptable to the reader in terms of transparency. In such cases, we would not be violating ethical standards.

*Jamal Azimov:* Thank you for your insights, Elvin. Does anyone have anything to add? If not, we can move on to the next questions. As we have already discussed the broader international trends, now we can move on to the local context. In Azerbaijan specifically, the main goal of the law reviews is to achieve increasing influence in the academic sphere. This influence may manifest itself in legislative updates, judicial practice or in academia itself. What strategies should we adopt to strengthen the influence of our journals across these areas?

*Ilham Zulfugarli:* If we have a goal of changing the entire system toward positive, it can not be done in a short timeframe. As they say, Rome was not built in one day. First of all, legal thinking must be developed within society, including within the legal community itself. As lawyers, we must begin by developing legal thinking within ourselves.

Secondly, there is an issue with the practical manifestation of legal thinking within the legislation. This issue is intrinsically linked to broader social-public problems. When addressing social problems via legislation, we encounter certain realities. It is necessary for our articles and journals to reflect these realities and solutions in the face of them. If we succeed in establishing legal thinking in society, then, of course, this will be reflected in our textbooks.

Additionally, in Azerbaijan, the interpretation and application of law are shaped by judgements of the Supreme Court and Constitutional Court. In those judgements, distinguished legal scholars frequently take part as expert advisors. It would be valuable to invite these scholars to contribute articles addressing pressing legal issues—or, where such work already exists, to prioritise their publication in our journals. As these individuals are well-recognised within the legal community, their contributions could play a critical role in shaping legal thought, influencing legislative reforms, and ultimately affecting practical legal developments. Nevertheless, this is not a transformation that can occur within one or two years. Consistency is crucial. Through sustained effort, we can achieve meaningful progress.

*Jamal Azimov:* Thank you very much, Ilham. I would like to direct my final question on this topic to Mansur. As a young lawyer, do you believe that academic articles will, in the future, be cited or considered by national courts when rendering decisions?

**Mansur Samadov:** Generally speaking, I believe that the concept of “law journal” does not exist in Azerbaijan.<sup>11</sup> When we say law journal, we are actually translating the concept of “law review.” It is essential not to confuse it with normal law journals. In order to understand what “Law Review” means, it is important to look at its history.

Law reviews first emerged in the 19th century under the auspices of bar associations. However, they were not law reviews as we know them today. They were mainly intended to provide information by covering recent court rulings, legal developments, changes in legal education, codification efforts, and related news, presented in a journalistic rather than an academic style.<sup>12</sup> Although some short articles were included, they were usually buried in the middle sections; these practitioner-focused journals generally opened with comments or editorials, continued with short articles and case reports, and ended with digests and book notices.<sup>13</sup>

The origins of the modern law review can be traced back to 1887 with the founding of the Harvard Law Review. It began with a small group of Harvard students, members of a club devoted to legal writing, who envisioned a new platform for serious academic debate. From these modest beginnings, they established the first student-run law review dedicated to publishing scholarly work—an initiative that would later shape legal education and scholarship across the world.<sup>14</sup>

Although early reactions to student-edited law reviews were sceptical, with some judges dismissing them as the “*work of boys*”, their influence steadily grew.<sup>15</sup> By the late 19th century, law review articles had begun to appear in U.S. Supreme Court opinions.

However, the citation of law review articles by courts became the norm following President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s appointments to the Supreme Court. Statistics from various sources showcase this clearly.<sup>16</sup> This shift is evident from the notable increase in the frequency and prominence of legal scholarship in judicial opinions during that period.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Although the notions of “law journal” and “law review” differ from each other, in the Azerbaijani language both terms are translated as the same.

<sup>12</sup> Michael I. Swygert, Jon W. Bruce, *The Historical Origins, Founding, and Early Development of Student-Edited Law Reviews*, 36 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 229, 760–63 (2009).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*, 759.

<sup>14</sup> Michael L. Closen & Robert J. Dzielak, *The History and Influence of the Law Review Institution*, 30 Akron Law Review, 10–11 (1997). Available at:

<https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/akronlawreview/vol30/iss1/2/> (last visited Apr. 28, 2025).

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*, 6.

<sup>16</sup> Philippa Strum, Louis D. Brandeis: Justice for the People, 364 (1984).

<sup>17</sup> During the 1939 Court term, 27 opinions cited 66 legal periodicals, compared to just 7 opinions citing 27 periodicals the previous year. Between 1939 and 1943, approximately 17% of Supreme Court opinions cited legal scholarship, a figure that rose to 28% from 1944 to

In other words, as a product of that system, Law Reviews met the standards of their time and were often cited in court decisions. In the American experience, one way to assess the success of an academic article was to examine how often it was cited by courts and used in practice.

However, the situation in Azerbaijan is different. Even if we create our own version of a law review, we can not apply the same system directly. We must chart a different course here. While the main objective of a traditional law review can be to influence court decisions, our focus should instead be on contributing to academic discourse and public debate. In my opinion, we should not aim to influence court decisions because it is not fit for our system. Instead, we should aim to disseminate ideas within the academic community and society more broadly. Over time, as these ideas spread, they may indirectly influence legislative changes or inspire new policy initiatives.

**Jamal Azimov:** Thank you, Mansur. I would like to address the final question of our panel discussion to Rufat. Rufat, the *Baku State University Law Review* was indexed in Scopus during your tenure as Editor-in-Chief. A crucial aspect of being indexed in Scopus is that it signifies our journal's integration into the international academic discourse. With that in mind, my question is, what steps do you believe Azerbaijani journals should take to better integrate into the international discourse and to contribute to it more actively?

**Rufat Naghiyev:** Thank you for such an interesting question. I believe there are several ways to achieve this goal. First, in order to contribute meaningfully to the international arena, Azerbaijani authors should interpret and present our national legislation in English for an international audience. Second, we can advance this effort by conducting comparative analyses between Azerbaijani legislation and the laws of other countries.

Furthermore, we can contribute to the global legal debate by collaborating with foreign authors and by actively participating in international conferences. Likewise, we should encourage partnerships with foreign universities, researchers, and doctoral students, inviting them to publish their articles and research in our journals. Through these strategies, we can build a law review that is reliable, shaped by years of experience, and widely recognised. Over time, both domestic and international scholars could view the journal as a platform for legal discussion, and the resulting increase in citations would significantly enhance our influence.

**Jamal Azimov:** Thank you, Rufat. Does anyone have anything to add?

**Ilham Zulfugarli:** I would like to add a point. If we want our law review to become part of a legal discussion or mechanism abroad or to exert influence on such developments, we must ensure that the articles we publish address

---

1948. See Chester A. Newland, *Legal Periodicals and the United States Supreme Court*, 3 *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 58 (1959).

the needs of the international audience. Let us assume that a particular article is the result of years of diligent effort and demonstrates high scholarly quality. Nevertheless, if the article's topic lacks relevance within the foreign legal sphere, it will have limited impact, as there will be little incentive for anyone abroad to engage with it. Therefore, the careful selection of article topics is a critical factor. In short, an article should address developments occurring in foreign jurisdictions and capture the interest of the key actors involved in those processes.

*Jamal Azimov:* This point further connects with the idea of aligning ourselves with emerging trends, as we discussed earlier. We must follow these developments to position ourselves at the centre of international legal discourse.

If our panellists have no additional remarks, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all the panellists for their valuable insights and to the audience for their attention. We hope that this panel discussion will contribute to our own growth, to the future of the Baku State University Law Review, and to the broader development of law review culture in Azerbaijan. Thank you all once again, and have a great day!