

Classics Ireland
The Journal of the Classical Association of Ireland
Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

1. Thank you for agreeing to review a manuscript for Classics Ireland. All manuscripts submitted to Classics Ireland are subject to the journal's double-blind peer review process. The purpose of peer review is to aid the editor in making editorial and publishing decisions and help improve the quality of the manuscripts.
2. In normal circumstances, we expect to receive reports within three months. If unforeseen circumstances are likely to prevent you from completing your report within this timeframe, please notify the editor as soon as possible.
3. Reviewers should not evaluate manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions associated with the manuscript. If you have already commented on the manuscript at the request of either the author or another journal, you should disqualify yourself from reviewing the manuscript for Classics Ireland.
4. Manuscripts should be treated confidentially. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorised by the editor. As a reviewer, you should write your report in such a way as not to betray either your own identity or any surmises concerning the author's identity or the identity of other reviewers.
5. Review reports will be sent to the author(s). They should be written respectfully and objectively. Views should be expressed clearly and presented with supporting arguments. Personal criticism and unprofessional language are not appropriate.
6. Classics Ireland aims to publish contributions on all aspects of the language, history, archaeology, and literature of Greek and Roman antiquity, especially if there is an Irish dimension. Contributions to Classics Ireland should be scholarly, but not technical. All Greek and Latin must be translated. Minimal footnotes are preferred. Articles should not normally exceed 5,000 words. We ask you to bear this in mind when you are considering the merits of a manuscript for publication in Classics Ireland.
7. In your report, we would ask you to comment *inter alia* on the following:
 - a) the viability, significance and originality of the argument;
 - b) the methodological strengths and weaknesses of the paper;
 - c) the use of evidence to substantiate the argument;
 - d) the clarity, concision and style of the writing
 - e) omissions of relevant published scholarship
 - f) similarities with existing publications (including suspicions of plagiarism)
8. We ask in particular that you provide in your report a clear recommendation regarding publication, indicating whether in your professional opinion, the manuscript should be (a) rejected; or (b) accepted; or (c) accepted subject to the author making minor revisions and corrections; or (d) the author should be invited to make major changes to the manuscript with a view to resubmission and re-evaluation. This last recommendation should only be used if you feel the paper is very promising, and should be accompanied by explicit suggestions for corrections and/or additions.
9. Please submit your report electronically to the editor of Classics Ireland, Dr Shane Wallace, swallace@tcd.ie. This report should include the title of the paper, but not your own name or any other identifying information.

[11/11/2024]