



Guidelines for Reviewers

Reviewers for the ILAS in-house series are asked to comment on the academic contribution the volume makes to the field; the methodology, analysis and conclusions reached; and to provide a recommendation for the publication's readiness and suitability for publication.

Reviewers are ordinarily asked to provide their feedback within six weeks of their review copy having been dispatched by the Publications Office (eight weeks for longer volumes); an email will be sent as confirmation the copy has been sent. Reviewers are asked to inform the Publications Office if they do not receive their review copy within five working days of having been informed of its dispatch. If it would not be feasible to provide a review within six weeks, an extension can be discussed; this must be agreed in advance.

Reviewers are paid for their time and valuable comments as follows:

£85 for reviews returned within six weeks from the date the review copy is sent out. Extensions can be negotiated if this deadline is not possible.

Each manuscript is reviewed by two reviewers. The names of the reviewers and authors/editors will not be made known to one another unless either or both sides explicitly wish to waive their anonymity.

Reviewers may indicate that all or part of their comments are to be shared only with the ILAS publication series editor and/or Academic Planning Committee, but as general practice we urge reviewers to produce comments which can be shared with the author(s) and editor(s) of the volume being reviewed in order that they may strengthen their work. Comments may be made in the box below or as tracked changes within the document.

Title:

Comments:

Recommendation (please delete as appropriate):

- Accept without revisions
- Accept with minor revisions (as detailed in comments)
- Recommend for resubmission following substantive revisions (as detailed in comments)
- Reject – manuscript unlikely to reach minimum quality for publication even with substantive revision