**Guidelines for referees**

We ask for reviews within four weeks of receipt of a manuscript. If you need some additional time, please let us know.

**Conflicts of interest.** If you feel you have any conflict of interest -- anything that would interfere with you judging the manuscript at hand fairly -- please let us know immediately.

**Goal of the journal.** Diachronica aims to publish the highest quality research on all aspects of language change, language history and comparative linguistics, with a focus on structural aspects of language (as opposed to, for instance, fundamentally social issues like language shift.)

We especially seek scholarship that COMBINES NEW INSIGHTS OF THEORETICAL INTEREST WITH RIGOROUS ANALYSIS OF DATA. Papers should have a clearly diachronic orientation, as opposed to simply treating data from older languages synchronically. To appear in Diachronica, work also needs to be relevant to a broad audience of historical linguists, not only those working on particular languages or within particular frameworks.

**Summary recommendation.** We ask for your explicit overall assessment of how publishable the manuscript is. Our usual categories for editorial decisions are:

- accept,
- accept with revisions,
- revise and resubmit,
- reject.

'Accept' indicates a need for only minor changes, while 'accept with revisions' is used when changes are needed but do not involve the basic arguments or data, and are relatively modest overall. We make a decision of 'revise and resubmit' when we see real potential in a paper and find that additional work could yield a paper that could be published in our journal. Where such potential is uncertain or successful revision would lead to a different paper, 'reject' is the appropriate recommendation. Not all papers fit neatly into this taxonomy, but you are invited to use these categories if you find them helpful.

**Justification.** To support your recommendation, please lay out the strengths and weaknesses of the paper, and exemplify them using considerations such as these:

- Does the paper advance diachronic linguistics generally and the understanding of the history or reconstruction of particular languages in some important way?
- Are enough appropriate data presented to support the aims of the paper? Are they accurate, appropriately glossed, and clearly presented?
- Are the theoretical framework and methodology suitable? Is the paper appropriately situated in prior research?
- Is the paper clearly written and argued? Is its length appropriate for what it has to say?
- Is the paper situated appropriately in the relevant scholarly literature? Is previous research cited fully and appropriately?

Manuscript reviews should be helpful to the author. In addition to keeping a constructive tone, for example, if you refer to scholarly literature, full citations are useful.
Confidentiality. "Submitted manuscripts are privileged documents. Do not make them available to colleagues or students, or duplicate them for your future reference, unless the author’s permission is obtained." (From Language’s Guidelines for Referee Reports.)

Note that we traditionally acknowledge referees by listing their names in the final issue of each volume. If you prefer that we not list your name, please let us know.

Thanks for your assistance.