Journal of the History of Philosophy Peer Review Process

The *Journal of the History of Philosophy* is an internationally recognized quarterly that publishes peer-reviewed articles, notes, discussions, and book reviews devoted to the history of philosophy. In light of the expertise of our editorial team, we consider contributions in the following areas: Ancient Greek and Latin Philosophy, early to late Medieval Philosophy (Latin, Arabic, Hebrew), and European and Anglo-American philosophical traditions from the Renaissance to the twentieth century. We also consider contributions that explore historical influences between these areas and with traditions in the history of philosophy not mentioned here.

Authors must certify that their work is original, is not the product (in whole or in part) of Generative AI, has not appeared in print, and is not under consideration elsewhere. The *JHP* does not publish translations of work already published in a modern language.

All submissions are subject to initial review for suitability by an editorial committee consisting of the Editor, the Managing Editor, and members of the Editorial Board and Board of Directors with expertise relevant to the submission. Authors should consult the "*JHP* Advice for Authors" page for specific information about the criteria for sending papers for external review.

Submissions that meet the criteria for external review are double-blinded and sent to at least two referees. Referees invited by the *JHP* are chosen for their expertise and reliable judgment, and are expected to provide reports unaided by others or by AI. Uploading authors' work without their permission to an AI service violates the confidentiality that authors are owed, and puts their work at risk of being appropriated by others. Referees for the *JHP* should not use AI in any stage of the refereeing process.

Referees are asked to comment in their reports on

- the historical and philosophical significance of the topic;
- the paper's contribution to scholarship on the topic;
- the completeness of the discussion;
- the paper's familiarity with primary sources in their original language, appropriate editions, and/or relevant secondary literature;
- strengths and weaknesses of the paper;
- readability.

Finally, referees are asked to deliver one of four recommendations, keeping in mind that the *JHP* has a large backlog of articles to be published and cannot publish articles that are competent but make no extraordinary contribution to the literature.

1. *Outright Acceptance*: Publish in present form;
2. *Conditional Acceptance*: Publish after minor revisions;
3. *Revise and Resubmit*: Paper not publishable in present form; reject but invite resubmission of a revised version;
4. *Final Rejection*: Reject without an invitation to revise and resubmit.

If a referee chooses categories 1 or 2, the referee must consider that the topic is historically and philosophically significant and that the paper makes an original contribution to scholarship on the topic. If the referee chooses category 2 (conditional acceptance), the referee should indicate what revisions need to be made, and the editor's office will check whether the changes are made

by the author. If the referee chooses category 3 (revise and resubmit), the referee should consider that the topic is historically and philosophically significant, and that there is substantial evidence that the author can develop it to make an extraordinary contribution to scholarship on this topic. The referee should indicate what changes are required. The editorial office will typically ask the same referee(s) to review the revised version, should the author choose to submit one.

The Editor makes the final decision about the paper based on the readers' reports. Resubmissions of papers receiving a '3' (revise and resubmit) are considered new submissions, although we try to re-engage the original referees to evaluate the revised versions. The *JHP* will not consider for review revisions of papers that have received a final rejection, even if they have been significantly modified.

Our current average time review time from initial submission to final decision is 76 days. In 2025, our acceptance rate was 4.2%.