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Many thanks for your interest in reviewing a book for SJRCC! Here is some information for potential book review authors, which you may find useful.

**What sort of book reviews do you publish?**

We publish reviews of books which are likely to be of interest to our readership, including (but not limited to):

* Texts for social workers, residential care workers, foster carers, teachers, others in ‘the sector’, which relate to working with or supporting looked after and care experienced people across their lifespan. The focus does not need to be on residential care specifically.
* Books by care experienced authors (including fiction)
* Other books which have something relevant to say to those in the care experienced community and/or those who support care experienced people. If you have an idea that you aren’t sure of, get in touch and we can discuss it!

Books don’t have to be recently published, but for older books we would expect to see some comment on their relevance to a modern audience, for example by highlighting connections to other recent publications, reviews etc.

**What guidance do you offer for reviewers?**

We have some technical guidance we ask you to follow.

Book reviews should be **500-1000 words** long and written in **English**. The style and tone can be **more informal** than a typical journal article, but should be understandable to our international readership, and should contain no profanity, or discriminatory language or content.

Any context-specific terminology (e.g., ‘GIRFEC’, ‘The Promise’) should include a brief explanation for an international audience.

Further guidance on formatting and other technical guidance can be found in the separate Guidelines for Contributors document available in the Submission Pack on the journal web pages [here](https://www.celcis.org/knowledge-bank/sircc-journal/instructions_for_authors). Please read these guidelines in conjunction with this book review specific guidance.

We also have some non-technical guidance to consider in writing your review:

* It’s usual to include a brief background on the book (what it’s about, who it’s by, why you think it’s relevant to review it). You may wish to comment on the content of the book, the structure, the usefulness to a modern audience, the relevance to your own work or context, and/or something else you think is important for potential readers of the book to know.
* Book reviews are your own opinion. You can say what you liked and didn’t like about the book, for example what you think is particularly useful or well written, what’s missing or could have been done better, what would have made the book more useful or relevant to you or in your context. The important part is that you should try to **explain and evidence your views** (e.g., using quotes or examples, with page references).

**What else do you need review authors to provide?**

We will need the details of the book you reviewed, especially if this is not a book that we have provided to you for review. This includes the title, author, date of publication, publisher, and ISBN number.

As well as the text of your review, we ask for your name and affiliation (which may or may not be a job title – we can discuss this if needed), and ideally an email address where readers can contact you (although this is not obligatory).

We also like to have a brief ‘About the review author’ at the end, so readers can understand a little bit about your personal perspective on the book you’ve reviewed.

**Anything else I need to know?**

We aim to be an encouraging and supportive Journal, and any comments from the editors on your submission will be offered in this spirit. We expect the process of finalising your review to be as collaborative as possible, and welcome informal discussions or draft submissions at an early stage, should you feel you would benefit from that level of support. If you prefer to do this via phone or MS Teams rather than email, please let us know!

If you have any other questions, please don’t hesitate to get in touch.