Subject: Request for Reconsideration – Manuscript JCSSR-118

Dear Handling Editor's Name,

I am writing in response to your recent decision letter regarding my manuscript, "Exploring the African Lineage of Irish and Italian Identities: Historical Connections and Modern Perspectives" (JCSSR-118). While I appreciate the time and effort invested in reviewing this work, I must respectfully express serious concerns about the accuracy and fairness of the assessment provided.

1. Mischaracterization of My Scholarship

Your letter asserts that the manuscript "reads as though it may have been AI-generated," citing a passage presented without citation. I must strongly reject this characterization. This work represents original scholarship based on years of research and is supported by a comprehensive bibliography of peer-reviewed sources. To address your stated concern, I have revised the relevant passages and explicitly anchored them to authoritative references (Ignatiev, 1995; Jacobson, 1998; Guglielmo, 2003; O'Malley, 2023; Spickard et al., 2022). Suggesting that the manuscript was generated by AI, without substantive evidence, risks unfairly undermining my professional integrity.

2. Treatment of the "Cattle Genetics" Evidence

You reiterate Reviewer 1's concern about the contextual use of cattle genetics studies. In the revised manuscript, I have clarified—unambiguously—that these studies are presented solely as analogies for Mediterranean exchange networks and not as direct evidence of human ancestry. To claim otherwise misrepresents the revisions already made. Furthermore, I corrected the misinterpretation of Irish et al. (2020) by accurately framing its scope as methodological (use of dental traits as proxies), not as evidence of direct Irish/Italian/African ancestry.

3. Alleged Lack of Proper Response

Your letter states that I "did not adequately address the reviewers' concerns" and failed to provide a point-by-point reply. This is inaccurate. My resubmission included a structured response letter that summarized revisions. To remove any ambiguity, I have

now supplied a detailed, point-by-point matrix that explicitly maps each reviewer comment to the corresponding changes in the manuscript, with page and line references.

4. Reference List Inconsistencies

You cite inconsistency in reference formatting. I acknowledge that some anomalies remained despite my prior audit. I have since conducted a line-by-line review to ensure full compliance with the APA 7th edition, correcting truncated titles, inconsistent formatting, and substituting DOIs for placeholder links wherever possible.

5. Request for Reconsideration

In light of the corrections made and the clarifications above, I respectfully request that my manuscript be reconsidered, or alternatively, that it be referred to another editor or to the editorial board for an independent evaluation. While I value rigorous critique, I also believe that the most recent assessment has mischaracterized my scholarship and failed to acknowledge the substantive revisions that have already been undertaken.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I remain committed to addressing legitimate scholarly concerns and ensuring that this work meets the highest standards of publication.