

Editors

Lorenzo CALVELLI
(Venezia)

Federico SANTANGELO
(Newcastle)

Editorial Board

Luciano CANFORA
(Bari)

Jo-Marie CLAASSEN
(Stellenbosch)

Massimiliano DI FAZIO
(Pavia)

Patricia FORTINI BROWN
(Princeton)

Helena GIMENO PASCUAL
(Alcalá de Henares)

Anthony GRAFTON
(Princeton)

Judith P. HALLETT
(College Park, Maryland)

Katherine HARLOE
(Reading)

Jill KRAYE
(London)

Arnaldo MARCONE
(Roma)

Marc MAYER
(Barcelona)

Laura MECELLA
(Milano)

Leandro POLVERINI
(Roma)

Stefan REBENICH
(Bern)

Ronald RIDLEY
(Melbourne)

Michael SQUIRE
(London)

William STENHOUSE
(New York)

Christopher STRAY
(Swansea)

Daniela SUMMA
(Berlin)

Ginette VAGENHEIM
(Rouen)

HCS

History of Classical Scholarship

Ethical Code

History of Classical Scholarship (HCS)

<https://www.hcsjournal.org>

History of Classical Scholarship (HCS) is a peer-reviewed scientific journal whose policy is inspired by the COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) Ethical Code. See the Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors (https://publicationethics.org/files/u2/Best_Practice.pdf).

The following guidelines are aligned with the principles set out in the *Committee on Publication Ethics* Core Practices (<https://doaj.org/publishers>) and the Code of Conduct of the *Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association* (<https://oaspa.org/membership/code-of-conduct/>).

General Working Principles

The Editors are responsible for the vetting of the submissions to the journal and for the oversight of the production process.

They seek advice from the Editorial Board on specific aspects concerning the management of the journal and on the resolution of any disagreements that might arise between them.

The Editors and the Editorial Board are committed to fostering the expression of academic freedom and to ensuring the soundness and fairness of the review process. The Editors are tasked with ensuring an impartial and timely peer review, the anonymity of referees, and the confidentiality of the process.

They are willing to implement factual corrections to specific aspects of individual articles after their publication, and to consider submissions that directly respond to papers previously published in *HCS*.

They are committed to acting swiftly upon any reports of plagiarism or self-plagiarism that might be brought to their attention about work published in *HCS*.

The Journal and Its Contributors

Submissions are assessed on the basis of their intrinsic originality, rigour, and significance, and irrespective of the ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, religious beliefs, and scholarly, political or ideological orientation of the author(s).

Contributors are fully responsible for the contents of the articles that they submit for consideration. They are expected to vouch for the originality of their work, the accuracy of the information they present, and the lack of any potential conflicts of interest affecting the results obtained or the interpretations suggested. If an author or a member of the Editorial Board identifies a case in which a submission should not be reviewed by a specific scholar because of a possible conflict of interest, the Editors will take that into serious and careful consideration. If a paper is based on external research funding, the Author(s) should clearly acknowledge it.

By submitting their work to *HCS*, they accept the validity of its review process, and they undertake not to submit the same piece of work elsewhere until a decision on its acceptance is reached.

Contributors are required to resolve any copyright issues ahead of publication.

HCS is committed to the free and open circulation of knowledge, and does not apply any Article Processing Charges at any stage of the review and production process.

Duties of the Referees

Referees undertake to work objectively and independently, and to provide clear and thorough feedback on the submissions they are asked to consider for *HCS*.

Report should typically include a concise summary of the main thesis of the paper, along with a brief description of its approach and a view on its importance and timeliness. Primarily, however, readers are asked to comment on the following points: whether the paper is thoughtful, coherent and clearly written; whether it makes its case convincingly; whether the primary sources are handled with a competent and scholarly method; whether the bibliography is comprehensive; whether the manuscript makes a sufficiently substantial original contribution to scholarship to warrant publication; whether any parts

of the paper should be expanded or cut; and whether the title is informative and effectively phrased.

The report should end with a clear recommendation, leading to one of four possible outcomes: 1. the paper is acceptable as is or with minor corrections; 2. the paper is acceptable with substantial revisions; 3. the paper might be acceptable with major revisions (a scenario that implies a second round of refereeing and no outright acceptance of the paper); 4. the paper is not acceptable.

The report may be presented as a discursive text or as a set of answers to the questions listed in a template that is presented to the referees along with the invitation to review the manuscript.

Referees are required to respect the confidentiality of the review process at all times, and must avoid any references that might identify them. The report should be written in such a way that it may be sent directly to the contributor. *Ad hominem* remarks must be avoided under any circumstances. If readers have separate comments they would like to share with the Editors in confidence, they should clearly single them out in their private communications with the editors. In case the identity of the author(s) is known to them, or should they have already seen the paper, referees are asked to contact the Editors before starting their review.

Referees are usually asked to produce their reports within eight weeks of receipt of the manuscript, although extensions may be agreed on a bespoke basis. The Editors aim, at any rate, to reach a decision on a manuscript within three months of submission.

The final decision on the acceptance of a submission to *HCS* rests with the Editors, who provide a full rationale for their conclusions to the author(s). Their view is considered final, unless the author(s) alert(s) them to an important factual error in the comments of a referee: in that case, the view of another external reader may be sought.

Publisher and Funding

HCS is published by *History of Classical Scholarship*, a voluntary unincorporated association established under British law, whose membership consists of the Editors of the journal.

The sponsors of the journal are listed on the journal website.

Editorial Process

Submissions may be addressed to the Editors at any time, and are assessed through a double-blind peer review process, involving at least one reader chosen outside the Editorial Board. A third view may be sought if there is a clear disagreement between the two readers and the Editors do not feel qualified to resolve it independently. Referees are chosen and approached by the Editors, who may seek preliminary advice from individual members of the Editorial Board.

Responses to articles previously published in *HCS*, the editions of previously unpublished manuscripts, and review articles are assessed by the Editors, who may seek, where appropriate, the views of external readers.

HCS does not impose a prescriptive style sheet. However, submissions must be highly consistent internally, both in formatting style and referencing conventions.

Intellectual Property

Articles published in *HCS* are licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Allegations of Misconduct

If the Editors and/or Editorial Board notice (or receive notifications of) mistakes or inaccuracies, conflict of interest or plagiarism in a published article, they will immediately warn the Author and will undertake the necessary actions to resolve the issue. They will do their best to correct the published content whenever they are informed that it contains scientific errors or that the authors have committed unethical or illegal acts in connection with their published work. If necessary, they will withdraw the article or publish a recantation.

All complaints are handled in accordance with the guidelines published by the COPE.

Concerns and complaints must be addressed to the Editors. The letter should contain the following information:

- 1) complainant's personal information;
- 2) title, author(s), publication date;
- 3) complaint(s);
- 4) declaration that the complainant has no conflict of interest, or declaration of an actual or potential conflict of interest.

Accessibility

Accepted papers are published in Open Access format at <https://www.hcsjournal.org> as soon as the final set of proofs has been checked and approved by the author(s).

HCS publishes papers in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese or Modern Greek. Each article is preceded by an abstract in English and (where relevant) in the language in which it is written.

The preferred citation format for papers published in *HCS* is the following:

G. González Germain, 'Conrad Peutinger, Reader of Inscriptions: A Note on the Rediscovery of His Copy of the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* (Rome, 1521)', *HCS* 1 (2019), 1-21.

Post-Publication Discussions and Corrections

When Authors find a mistake or an inaccuracy in their own article, they must immediately inform the Editors, providing all the information needed to make the required adjustments.

Last revised: 27.08.2023