Guidelines for Reviewers and Author Responses

Reviews in History is published by the University of London’s Institute of Historical Research. It is intended as a forum for serious engagement with contemporary works of history. The readership comprises many university academics and post-graduates, as well as undergraduates and others who have a wide and thorough knowledge of historical and historiographical issues. One of its distinctive features is that authors of works reviewed in the journal have the opportunity to respond to the review.

Procedure
All reviews are commissioned by the editorial team (contact details below). Unsolicited reviews will not be accepted, although suggestions from prospective reviewers for works to review are welcomed. In all cases, Reviews in History reserves the right not to publish any review, review article or author response.

Content
Reviews should aim to summarize the main points of the work under consideration, critiquing the methodology or offering alternative arguments or suggestions where appropriate. Consideration should be given to the work’s role and purpose in a wider context, as well as to the author’s use of sources, organization and presentation. Errors of fact or typographical errors can be pointed out, but should not be dwelt on unless the reviewer feels they compromise the validity of the work as a whole. Reviewers are discouraged from indulging in personal comment or attacks. Reviews should aim to be professional, courteous and temperate.

Format and length
Reviews and authors’ responses should be between 2,000 and 3,000 words. Review Articles are not bound by word length. If you plan to deviate significantly from these lengths, please contact the editorial team. Reviews should begin with the author(s)/editor(s) and title of the work(s) under review, place of publication, the publisher, year of publication, number of pages, price and ISBN number of the work. Where applicable, institutional affiliations of both reviewers and authors will be included at the start of the review.

Quotations and citations
Short quotations from the text under review should be cited in single inverted commas with the page number(s) following in parentheses. Short quotations from other sources should be cited in single inverted commas; quotations of more than 25 words in length should be indented from the left-hand margin. Reviewers are asked to keep notes and references to a minimum. Where a note is required, please insert the footnote number enclosed in parentheses into the review and write a corresponding numbered footnote in natural text at the end of the review.

Please do not use automated footnoting features available on word processing packages, as these delay conversion to html. Underlining, bold type and italics may all be used as normal, but please avoid using superscript type.

Citations of works should follow these basic guidelines:
1: for books, author’s name (normally initials and surname), the full title, number of volumes (where applicable), place of publication and date of the whole work, volume and page reference (where applicable), e.g. John Smith, Reviews in History (3 vols, London, 1999), iii, p. 231.
In edited volumes, the name(s) of the editors should precede the title, e.g. John Smith and Jane Doe, eds, *Reviews in History*.


3: for articles, the author and title, journal, volume number and year, and page reference, e.g. John Smith, ‘My work’, *Reviews in History*, 3 (1999), 2-12.

**NB** When giving page references, p. is used for books but not for journal articles.

**NB** Title case is used for references to books, but chapter, article and dissertation titles should be in lower case.

**Author response**

The purpose of the author response is as much to extend the debate as to respond to particular points made in the initial review. As a right of reply, content must be for the author to determine, but *Reviews in History* does not encourage responses based on personal differences. Authors are not of course obliged to respond to reviews of their work. If you do not wish to respond, an agreed form of words (e.g. ‘Author declined to respond’, or ‘The author is pleased to accept this review without any further comment’) will appear on the webpages. Authors will be sent the completed review prior to its distribution via the *Reviews in History* mailing list with a request to respond.

**Submission**

The preferred method of submitting reviews or author responses is via e-mail to the Deputy Editor. The review should be submitted as an attachment in Word 97 (or compatible) files or .rtf files. The body of the message should indicate the word processing package used if not Word.

When submitting a piece of work, please include reliable contact details; the editorial team may need to contact you once the text is submitted.

**Licence agreement**

*Reviews in History* uses a *Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike Licence Agreement*. Under the terms of this *Creative Commons licence* (which applies only to the use of this work for non-commercial purposes), other parties are free to copy and distribute this work, and to make derivative works, under condition that the original author is given full credit, and that if this work is altered, transformed, or built upon, the resulting work may only be distributed under a licence identical to this one. A copy of the licence form will be supplied by the deputy editor, and this will need to be completed before the review can be published.

**Dissemination**

Completed work is circulated to subscribers to the *Reviews in History* mailing list. There are currently around 4,000 subscribers and reviews are sent out every week. After circulation, reviews and responses are posted on the *Reviews in History* website (at www.history.ac.uk/reviews).

**Contacts**

Contact the Deputy Editor: ihr.reviews@sas.ac.uk