American Political Science Review (2017) 111, 1, iii–x
doi:10.1017/S0003055416000757 © American Political Science Association 2017

Notes from the Editors

The new editorial team at the University of Mannheim and London School of Economics and Political Science would like to take this opportunity, in our first "Notes from the Editors," to express our great thanks to the *APSA* Presidents Jennifer Hochschild and David Lake, President-elect Kathleen Thelen, the *APSA* staff, the Council, and the Publications Committee, as well as to Cambridge University Press, for their support and guidance during this transition process. The decision to transfer the editorship of the *Review* to Europe has caused some astonishment on both sides of the Atlantic. And indeed, the collaboration of a British-German editorial team that will process manuscripts from scholars around the world seems to contrast the recent political events that herald scattered regionalism instead of global competition. Admittedly, we had to overcome organizational, legal, and political hurdles to realize this transfer. But with the help of *APSA* Executive Director Steven Rathgeb Smith, *APSA* Director of Publications Barbara Walthall, and Mark Zadrozny from Cambridge University Press, we were able to master all challenges. We would also like to thank John Ishiyama for his support during this process, which officially ended on September 1. Finally, we would like to thank the members of the *APSR* editorial board for their willingness to support our work over the upcoming years, and those reviewers who spent valuable time and resources to serve our profession.

As you might have seen, one of our innovations is to offer two publication formats. *Manuscripts* are the classic 12,000 word original pieces that advance our understanding of important political issues and are of general interest to the field of political science. Our new format, *Letters,* are 4,000 word pieces that address an important research problem or question, showing a novel perspective on existing research and encouraging scholarly debate in the discipline.

We also clarified our review process, prior publication, reproduction, and disclosure policies in our updated submission guidelines. In addition to improving representativeness and quality, we want to increase the transparency of the review process and better understand its effectiveness. This means that we will collect and present data on the number of (invited) reviewers, the duration of the review process, and the rules used for the editors' decisions on the manuscript. In the end, however, the success of all of our efforts will depend on the support that we receive from our colleagues and their willingness to serve our profession.

This issue (Volume 111, Number 1) is the first produced by our team but all articles that are published were processed by our predecessors at UNT. Hence, most of the credit for this issue should be given to UNT. Due to a sizeable backlog we expect that this will also apply to the next issue (Volume 111, Number 2). We will continue their tradition of providing a brief introduction summarizing the basic arguments of every article in each issue. This issue's articles speak to a wide audience in political science, covering topics such as normative theory, comparative politics, international relations, political economy, and formal modeling. They address questions on trust, lobbying, power, conflict, elections, parties, and the working of democracy.

The relationship between trade liberalization and domestic market protection has been a focus for the study of political economy for the past decades. While most of the current work assumes that the variation in trade policy comes from interindustry differences, it remained an open question that explains the within-industry variation in tariff rates. In his article "Political Cleavages within Industry: Firm-level Lobbying for Trade Liberalization," In Song Kim offers a theoretical explanation based on firm-level lobbying that predicts which firms lobby for product-specific liberalization. Accordingly, product differentiation eliminates collective action problems among exporting firms and further motivates productive exporting firms to lobby the government for lower tariffs. Also, product differentiation reduces the worries about product substitution among domestic firms and makes them less likely to oppose open trade. Kim examines his theory using an original data set that combines bill information derived from lobbying reports filed under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 and economic data from financial databases. Consistent with his theory, he finds that productive firms lobby more often when their industries are comprised of differentiated products, and firms lobby to reduce trade barriers on specific products. This is an important contribution that questions the standard assumptions about the origins of trade policy preferences and provides a successful application of firm-level data.

The conventional wisdom in the international relations literature suggests that states have strong incentives to achieve power balance against other states, and that equally powerful states are more likely to experience conflict. However, empirically we observe very few conflicts. Specifically, Douglas M. Gibler argues in his article "State Development, Parity, and International Conflict" that the correlation between parity and conflict is spurious. The reason is that state capabilities and dyadic power differences are largely fixed over time, while Gibler points to the nature and development of state capabilities that are the driving factors of conflicts. When uncertainty explains the parity-conflict relationship, which decreases with power asymmetry, the type and timing of state system entry predicts both the likelihood of parity in any given country-dyad, but also that dyad's propensity for conflict. State-making and system entry may change the situation and lead to more power symmetry, which promotes peace at a low and conflict at a high level. Using a well-established measure on dyadic power parity and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000757 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the militarized dispute onset in the period of 1816–2001, Gibler reveals that there is no evidence for the parity-conflict relationship and that this relationship is simply a product of factors associated with state system entry.

In "A Problem-Based Approach to Democratic Theory," Mark E. Warren criticizes the common style of thinking in the ongoing democratic theory debate about deliberation, elections, and other models of democracy that prescribe the organization of democracy into a political system. This leads to a variety of labels of democracy, such as electoral democracy, multiparty democracy, competitive democracy, or deliberative democracy, which only describe particular practices of procedural, organizational, or communicative responses to disagreement and preference and collective will formation without answering the question what we should expect to accomplish in a democracy. Warren proposes an alternative strategy to make democratic theories normatively more robust as well as sufficiently fine-grained when discussing democratic deficits in complex political systems. By distinguishing between functions/systems and practices/institutions he develops a problem-based approach that first asks for the kind of problems a political system has to solve if it is to function democratically. The second question addresses the strengths and weaknesses of generic political practices, such as deliberating, representing, voting, etc., as ways and means of addressing problems. To that respect, the conclusion is that a democratic political system should empower inclusion, form collective agendas and wills, and have capacities to make collective decisions. Based on these pillars, common democratic practices can then be theorized as to what extent they maximize a political system's democratic problem-solving capacities.

The (responsible) party government model of political representation has been a dominant form of democratic governance over the past decades. However, this model is accused of having lost the capacity to be responsive to the public and responsible for the policy outcomes. In "Will vs. Reason: The Populist and Technocratic Forms of Political Representation and Their Critique to Party Government," Daniele Caramani proposes that populist mobilization—an often addressed factor—and technocratic management—a less discussed perspective—can be considered as two alternative forms of governance to the dominant party government model. Both alternatives share a unitary, nonpluralist, unmediated and unaccountable vision of society's general interest. However, technocracy stresses the delegation of authority to experts in order to identify the general interest from rational speculation for the people. In contrast, populism stresses responsiveness to the people through leaders who equate the putative interest with the will of the people. Caramani ends with an inspiring discussion about the difficulties for political parties to address both populist and technocratic challenges when trying to find a balance between responsiveness and responsibilities, respectively.

How does democracy promote well-being as our ability to live as we would like? Although the literature has generally agreed that democratic practice can provide citizens with better lives, there is still a wide variation in well-being across and within democracies that is associated with different standards in health, employment, and other economic and societal conditions. In "Democracy at Work: Moving Beyond Elections to Improve Well-Being," Michael Touchton, Natasha Borges Sugiyama, and Brian Wampler attempt to uncover how exactly democracy promotes well-being by explaining the variation in infant mortality rates in Brazil. They examine whether civil, political, and social rights help people to live a better life. Using original data from Brazil covering 5,570 Brazilian municipalities for the period 2006–2013, they demonstrate how local policy councils and federal social programs interactively reduce infant mortality rates, while the results for the effect of competitive elections remain mixed. The findings suggest the strongest influence comes from the interaction between participatory institutions, innovative social programs, and local state capacity.

The perceived tension between Tocqueville's works on promoting democracy and defending the French Empire has raised an intense debate over the century. Should Tocqueville's defense of democratic liberty be discounted because of his support for the French colonial policy toward Algeria? Drawing on evidence from Tocqueville's published writings, parliamentary speeches, notes, and correspondence, Ewa Atanassow argues in "Democracy and Colonization: Tocqueville Reconsidered" that Tocqueville's views on democracy and colonialism are in fact reconcilable: he was critical of the French colonial regime and colonization in general. Accordingly, the image of Tocqueville as a committed colonizer is a common misperception that arises when ignoring the broader civilizational vision of his work that viewed European expansionism as an instrument of the global movement towards equality. This suggests that Tocqueville considered colonization as an important tool to disseminate democratic values. As a result, rather than a departure from democratic liberty, colonization serves as a pivotal moment in the democratizing process.

Recent scholarship has largely considered that political parties are in crisis and that parties may no longer serve as the mediator between society and state. In their article "The Crisis of Party Democracy, Cognitive Mobilization, and the Case for Making Parties More Deliberative," Carlo Invernizzi-Accetti and Fabio Wolkenstein attempt to identify the potential cause of the crisis of parties and then propose that parties need to become more internally democratic and deliberative. Drawing on evidence from the empirical literature on civic culture and party democracy, they identify the transformation in the nature of the demand by a more informed and educated electorate as a convincing answer for the reason of the crisis of party democracy (as compared to the overall decrease of this demand). Accordingly, if political parties are perceived as too bureaucratic and elite-dominated by a more informed and educated electorate, their prescriptive model of deliberative intraparty democracy describes the necessary change in the parties' organizational structure. This model

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000757 Published online by Cambridge University Press

includes an empowering of local party branches, the discussion in executive committees, and the creation of function-specific fora within (technology-friendly) parties. Walking through potential objections, they defend their model as the most appropriate response to the demands of an increasingly more cognitively mobilized citizenry, if parties want to regain their mediation function between society and the state.

In their article "Moral Power: How Public Opinion on Culture War Issues Shapes Partisan Predispositions and Religious Orientations," Paul Goren and Christopher Chapp examine the fascinating question of whether partisan and religious predispositions drive individuals' positions on culture war issues, or whether it is the other way around. Contrary to conventional wisdom and issue-based models of opinion change, Goren and Chapp argue that culture war attitudes are foundational elements in the political and religious belief systems that lead individuals to update their partisan and religious predispositions. Using data from panel studies covering the period 1992–2012, the study shows that opinions on culture war issues promote a revision of individuals' partisan affinities and religious orientations. More specifically, the analysis of the heatedly debated issues about abortion and gay rights reveals that partisan alignment and religious predisposition impact the issue-specific evaluation, while individual perspectives on these culture war issues update party loyalties and religion affiliation. This reversal finding of reversible partisanship and religiosity will have a major impact on fields including public opinion, political psychology, political parties, and religion and politics. It incentivizes scholars to reconsider the extent to which cultural attitudes need to be incorporated in models of party identification, religiosity, and public opinion.

How does incumbency affect representation work in countries where term limits and party weaknesses constrain the accountability of parties to voters? Rather than being privileged, incumbent parties are often situated at a disadvantageous position when it comes to winning municipal elections in Brazil. Marko Klašnja and Rocío Titiunik examine this puzzle in their article "The Incumbency Curse: Weak Parties, Term Limits, and Unfulfilled Accountability" by connecting this empirical regularity to institutional contexts, namely term limits and weak party discipline. Klašnja and Titiunik theorize that these factors discourage individual politicians to be accountable to both voters and political parties, which further result in electoral punishments. With an original Brazilian data set and a comparative data set in five additional Latin American countries, they find strong support for their argument. Specifically, they find that incumbent parties in mayoral elections tend to be electorally vulnerable, that the disadvantage to incumbent parties is concentrated in municipalities where a mayor is in the last term, that such disadvantage does not occur for the Brazilian Workers Party since it is a programmatic, cohesive, and high-disciplined party, and that the disadvantage is not limited to Brazil. This suggests that the interaction between party weakness and electoral rules that restrict reelection can compromise accountability in a way that perpetuates the weakness of a party system as a whole.

How should social media platforms be constructed to allow for interactions which are marked by democratic principles such as reciprocity, equality, and inclusion? In "The Architecture of Political Spaces: Trolls, Digital Media, and Deweyan Democracy," Jennifer Forestal draws from the work of John Dewey to outline a theory of democratic interactions focusing on the spatial dynamics of social media. She identifies boundedness and flexibility as two key characteristics of this space. With clearly demarcated boundaries one is more likely to enhance reciprocity. Flexibility, on the other hand, is necessary for developing new ideas and experiences. Using these criteria, Forestal evaluates Kinja, Gawker Media's commenting platform, both before and after trolls attacked the site in 2014. The trolling attacks took advantage of the website's anonymity and effectively disrupted the normal flow of conversations. However, by reintroducing tiered comments to prevent future trolling, Kinja failed to fully uphold the kind of creative flexibility which fosters the diversity of opinion and interest that characterizes democratic space. Thereby, Forestal's study illustrates the importance of (software) architectures for democratic discourses. Moreover, the findings highlight the common challenges that exist for both real and digital environments when trying to establish democratic principles that govern social (media) activity.

Under which conditions do politicians prompt bureaucrats to provide effective public services? The piece "Politicians, Bureaucrats, and Development: Evidence from India" by Saad Gulzar and Benjamin J. Pasquale compares two types of systems in which bureaucrats are supervised by either single or multiple political principals in the implementation of a key large-scale development program in India—the Natural Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. Gulzar and Pasquale argue that the political/bureaucrat relationship is critical for such programs and that electoral incentives are decisive for their success. The reason is that politicians face stronger incentives to motivate bureaucrats if they can internalize their own electoral benefits rather than sharing them with other politicians through overlapping jurisdictions. Using an original data set from the world's largest employment program covering nearly all villages in India, they apply a geographic regression discontinuity design, in which geographically proximate villages are compared with each other on treatments and controls. The findings show that the quality of public service decreases if bureaucrats have multiple political principals. This impressively highlights not only the relevance of principal agent-problems between political principals and bureaucratic agents, but also the importance of electoral incentives for the successful implementation of such program.

Courts produce legal outcomes out of factual scenarios by taking into account precedent cases and available doctrines. This creates challenges at each level of the judicial hierarchy where lower-level courts need to not only learn the facts of any legal dispute but also find

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000757 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the doctrine that resolves dispute and extrapolates on the implications of dispute resolution for future cases. Consequently, higher-level courts select specific cases to formulate doctrines that guide lower-level courts through all possible cases. The authors of "Precedent and Doctrine in a Complicated World," Steven Callander and Tom S. Clark, capture this learning process by modeling the mapping of case facts to legal outcomes in hierarchical judiciary decision making as a Brownian motion. This model of judicial learning and communication explores how lower-level courts can optimally adjudicate the gap between case facts and precedents, and how higher-level courts can optimally select cases. However, since uncertainty drives judicial decision making on all levels, the case selected almost never favors a winner party nor is it the most novel dissimilar one. This implies that this path-dependence increases complexity of law, legal carve-outs in adjudication, and a doctrine that is difficult to predict.

It has become common to comprehend Machiavelli's *Florentine Histories* as a break with his earlier writings of *Discourses* and *The Prince* due to the neglect of founders and princely redeemers. In contrast, John P. McCormick suggests in his essay "Faulty Foundings and Failed Reformers in Machiavelli's *Florentine Histories*" that the *Histories* continues to delineate the ways in which potential founders and reformers ought to exploit political opportunities, which was pervasive in Machiavelli's earlier writings. McCormick argues that the *Histories* presents Giano della Bella and Michele di Lando as political leaders whom Machiavelli implicitly advises to exploit the opportunities generated by soci(et)al conflicts for their own benefit and that of their patria. Similar to Moses, Romulus, and Brutus, Giano and Michele are confronted with opportunities that could and should have resulted in the vigorous reordering of politics. Thus, instead of solely being a historiography, McCormick shows that Machiavelli's *Histories* is a proposal of how Florence could have been refounded by a virtuous leader. He argues that, while Machiavelli explicitly writes that the designated audience for the *Histories* is the Medici prelates, friends, and florentine aristocracy, who "merchandised" Florence for their own purposes, Machiavelli intends for readers to apply what they learned from *Discourses* and *The Prince* to *Histories*, thereby convincingly demonstrating how the *Histories* functions as an implicit criticism of Florence's principality rather than a change in Machiavelli's political orientation.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

The *American Political Science Review* (*APSR*) publishes scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. A significant advance in understanding of politics—whether empirical, interpretive, or theoretical—is the criterion for publication in the *Review*. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates or answers an important research question of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must make their work understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

While committed to publishing research that is useful and accessible to the whole discipline, the *APSR* makes every effort to ensure that each submission is reviewed by scholars who are familiar with its substance and methodology. Editorial decisions grounded on those assessments are unlikely to be based on just one empirical benchmark. For example, the strength of quantitative empirical findings cannot be captured by any single criterion, such as the conventional .05 level of statistical significance. Similarly, the validity of an argument advanced in a process tracing case study is unlikely to be judged solely on the grounds that it passed a "smoking gun test." The journal's editors will evaluate manuscripts on a range of criteria, including substantive significance, theoretical aptness, the importance of the problem under study, methodological rigor, and the feasibility of obtaining additional evidence.

Articles should be self-contained. Authors should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of their basic research procedures (of course, reference to widely used databases, such as the American National Election Study or Polity IV or others, is acceptable and does not require exhaustive description).

The *APSR* fully expects authors to conform to generally accepted norms concerning the protection of human subjects, and the editors may require certification of appropriate institutional review.[1]

The *APSR* publishes original work. Submissions should not include tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that already have been published or are forthcoming in other places. In many cases, republication of such material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. Neither does the *APSR* consider submissions that are currently under review at other journals or that duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts submitted to other publishers (whether of books, printed periodicals, or online journals). If scholars have any questions about whether these policies apply to their submission, they should address the issues in a cover letter to the editors or as part of the author comments section during online submission. Authors should also notify the editors of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, during the pendency of the submission's review at the *APSR*—regardless of whether they have yet been accepted. The editors may request copies of related publications.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. Authors should follow the guidelines for preparing an

[1] One widely accepted guide to such norms is given by the American Anthropological Association's Code of Ethics, particularly Section III. http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/upload/AAA-Ethics-Code-2009.pdf

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000757 Published online by Cambridge University Press

anonymous submission in the "Specific Procedures" section that follows.

Manuscripts that, in the judgment of the co-editors, are largely or entirely critiques of, or commentaries on, articles previously published in the *Review* may be reviewed for possible inclusion in a forum section (subject to the discretion of the editors), using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts. Well before any publication, however, the *Review*'s editors will send such manuscripts to the scholar(s) whose work is being addressed, inviting them to comment to the editors and to submit a rejoinder, which also will be peer-reviewed. We do not publish rejoinders to rejoinders.

The *APSR* accepts only electronic submissions (at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr). The web site provides detailed information about how to submit, what formatting is required, and what type of digital files may be uploaded. Please direct any questions to the journal's editorial offices at apsr@unt.edu

Data Access, Production Transparency, and Analytic Transparency

The *APSR* expects authors to comply with the access and transparency obligations described on pp. 8–10 of APSA's *A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science* (2012). Researchers have an ethical responsibility to facilitate the evaluation of their evidence-based knowledge claims so that their work can be fully evaluated, including through replication when appropriate, or by providing sufficient evidence to permit others to develop their own interpretation from the materials. This involves providing access to the data or evidence underlying their analysis, and achieving production and analytic transparency. All relevant materials should be made available in a trusted digital repository (such as a partner in the Data Preservation Alliance for the Social Sciences (Data-PASS)) or through the *APSR*'s online appendices (housed with Cambridge University Press).[2] More specifically:

- *Data access*: Authors making evidence-based knowledge claims should provide clear and complete citations to the evidence that support those claims in the reference section of the article; citations should include a "persistent identifier" (e.g., a "digital object identifier" or DOI). Authors should also provide comprehensive documentation that describes the data or evidence in full (see below for more specific guidance on references). Authors are expected to make these data available if they themselves generated or collected them. However, if the protection of human subjects requires nondisclosure, if confidentiality agreements prohibit disclosure, if data are under legal constraint (i.e., they are classified, proprietary, or copyrighted), and/or if the logistical burden of sharing relevant data would be particularly high, the author will inform the editor at the time of submission. The editors can grant an exception with or without conditions, and may require an explanation of the restriction(s) prior to publication of the piece.
- *Production transparency*: Researchers providing access to evidence they themselves collected and/or generated are expected to offer a full account of the context in which the data were collected and/or generated and the procedures used to collect and/or generate them. They should also make available any research instruments they used (e.g., interview protocols, coding protocols, procedures for identifying appropriate informants). Researchers whose claims are based on analysis of a dataset they created themselves should clearly describe how they assembled the dataset.
- *Analytic transparency*: Researchers making evidence-based knowledge claims should clearly map the path from the evidence to the claims. In addition to information provided in the article's main text and footnotes, this path should be mapped in ways that correspond with the methodology employed. For example, researchers may wish to provide software code and associated supplemental material or a methodological appendix; or they can attach a transparency appendix (TRAX, see note [4] below). Generally, it is expected that researchers should make available materials sufficient to allow others to fully understand and, *where relevant and applicable*, reproduce their results.

These guidelines apply to all research in political science that combines evidence and analysis to reach conclusions. The *APSR* recognizes, however, that the general principles will be put into practice differently in different research traditions: different types of materials and information can be provided in different ways.[3]

- For example, for survey research, along with providing the parts of the dataset that they analyzed, authors might provide sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings; and a calculation of response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Standard:

[2] See http://www.data-pass.org/. Current Data-PASS members include the Institute for Quantitative Social Science at Harvard University, the Howard W. Odum Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill, the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan, the Electronic and Special Media Records Service Division, National Archives and Records Administration, the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut, the Social Science Data Archive at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), the Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research (CISER) at Cornell University, and the Qualitative Data Repository at Syracuse University.

[3] This parallels the position taken by APSA. See, for example, Guidelines for Data Access and Research Transparency for Qualitative Research in Political Science, and Guidelines for Data Access and Research Transparency for Quantitative Research in Political Science.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000757 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys (Lenexa, KS: AAPOR, 2006).[4] For observational data, authors should list the dataset in the reference section of their article, and provide the parts of the dataset that they analyzed.

- For example, for articles that analyze a *qualitative dataset* in aggregate (e.g., if using QCA/fs), authors should list the dataset in the reference section of their article, and provide the parts of the dataset that they analyzed. Where authors draw on *individual data sources* (e.g., books, interviews, newspaper articles, videos) as distinct inputs to the analysis, each source must be cited, and then listed in the reference section of their article. Whenever possible (within the confines of human subject protections and other exceptions mentioned in the section *Data Access*), authors should share the relevant fragment of sources that support contested or central empirical claims and make the original sources available to other researchers. If the evidence used to create the dataset or the individual sources were collected and/or generated by the author, she should provide a methodological appendix or section in the paper (that explains how the evidence was collected and/or generated and selected for citation), and all relevant evidence-collection instruments. These and analytical transparency requirements can be satisfied for qualitative research using individual sources by preparing a transparency appendix (TRAX) if the author chooses to do so.[5]
- For example, to achieve transparency in experimental research, authors can provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, payments to subjects, debriefing procedures, and so on.

Similarly, analytical transparency should be provided in ways that are relevant for the type of research that was undertaken, and the inferential and interpretive steps the author took to reach a conclusion.

At the time a manuscript is submitted to the *APSR* for review, authors must provide the main text, notes, bibliographic references, and any tables and diagrams. If they so choose (but this is not required), authors may also provide the underlying evidence, and information needed to achieve production and analytic transparency, as supplemental materials. These supplemental materials may be submitted as a file accompanying the manuscript submission or authors may provide a hyperlink to a trustworthy digital repository where the materials reside. Although not a requirement for submission, data access and production and analytical transparency materials may make the manuscript more understandable and more compelling for reviewers.

By the time the manuscript is published in the journal, the underlying data and materials necessary to meet APSA's data access, production transparency, and analytic transparency standards must be available in a trusted digital repository (such as a partner in the Data Preservation Alliance for the Social Sciences (Data-PASS)) or through the *APSR*'s online appendices (housed with Cambridge University Press), which are made accessible when the article is published.

For articles that include candidate gene or candidate gene-by-environment studies, the *APSR* uses the same policy as the journal *Behavior Genetics*[6]. In relevant part, that policy states that an article will normally be considered for publication only if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- It was an exploratory study or test of a novel hypothesis, but with an adequately powered, direct replication study *reported in the same paper*.
- It was an exploratory analysis or test of a novel hypothesis in the context of an adequately powered study, and the finding meets the statistical criteria for genome-wide significance—taking into account all sources of multiple testing (e.g., phenotypes, genotypes, environments, covariates, subgroups).
- It is a rigorously conducted, adequately powered, direct replication study of a previously reported result.

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 12,000 words, including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices intended for publication. Font size must be 12 point for all parts of the submission, including notes and references, and all body text (including references) should be double-spaced. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. Explanatory footnotes may be included but should not be used for simple citations; but do not use endnotes. Observe all of the further formatting instructions given on our web site. Doing so lightens the burden on reviewers, copyeditors, and compositors. Submissions that violate our guidelines on formatting or length will be rejected without review.

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by italicizing the entire name of the variable—the first time it is mentioned in the text—and by capitalizing its first letter in all uses. You should also use the same names for variables in text, tables, and figures. Do not use acronyms or computational abbreviations when discussing variables in the

[4] See http://www.aapor.org/standards.asp

[5] A TRAX consists of two elements: (1) a brief overview outlining the data-collection and data-generation processes employed and (2) activated (digitally enhanced) citations. Activated citations follow the format of traditional footnotes or endnotes, but are digitally augmented to include, for each source: (a) a precise and complete reference such that scholars can locate the source and find the relevant information within it; (b) a redaction of/excerpt from the source; (c) if needed, an annotation that explains how the source supports the textual claim with which it is associated; and (d) the source itself (if available and shareable) or a hyperlink thereto. For more details, see http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/A_Guide_to_Active_Citation/

[6] http://www.springer.com/psychology/journal/10519?detailsPage=pltci_624152

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000757 Published online by Cambridge University Press

text. All variables that appear in tables or figures should have been mentioned in the text, standard summary statistics (n, mean, median, standard deviation, range, etc.) provided, and the reason for their inclusion discussed.

For submission and review purposes, you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text, but with an in-text locator for each, in any case, e.g., [Table 3 about here].

If your submission is accepted for publication, you may also be asked to submit high-resolution digital source files of graphs, charts, or other types of figures. Following acceptance, all elements within any tables submitted (text, numerals, symbols, etc.) should be accessible for editing and reformatting to meet the journal's print specifications, e.g., they should not be included as single images not subject to reformatting.

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. Before submitting any manuscript to the *APSR*, download a PDF of the Transfer of Copyright Agreement from the Editorial Manager login page at http://www.editorialmanager.com/apsr and be sure its terms and requirements, as well as the permissions granted to authors under its provisions, are acceptable to you. A signed agreement will be required for all work published in this journal.
2. When you submit (at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr), you will be invited to provide a short list of appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. Do not include on this list anyone who has already commented on the research included in your submission. Likewise, exclude any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends. You may also "oppose" potential reviewers by name, as potentially biased or otherwise inappropriate, but you will be expected to provide specific reasons. The editors will refer to these lists in selecting reviewers, though there can be no guarantee that this will influence final reviewer selections.
3. You will also be required to upload a minimum of two separate files:

    a) An "anonymous" digital file of your submission, which should not include any information that identifies the authors. Also excluded should be the names of any other collaborators in the work (including research assistants or creators of tables or figures). Likewise do not provide in-text links to any online databases used that are stored on any personal web sites or at institutions with which any of the co-authors are affiliated. Do not otherwise thank colleagues or include institution names, web addresses, or other potentially identifying information.

    b) A separate title page should include the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, and e-mail address) for all credited authors, in the order their names should appear, as well as each author's academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgments or other author notes about the development of the research (e.g., previous presentations of it) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive all correspondence from the *APSR*. You may also choose to include a cover letter.

4. If your previous publications are cited, please do so in a way that does not make the authorship of the work being submitted to the *APSR* obvious. This is usually best accomplished by referring to yourself and any co-authors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited within the list of references. Your prior publications should be included in the reference section in their normal alphabetical location. Assuming that in-text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should not redact self-citations and references (possible exceptions being any work that is "forthcoming" in publication, and that may not be generally accessible to others). Manuscripts with potentially compromised anonymity may be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.
5. Please make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.

Tables and Figures

Tables and figures should be comprehensible without reference to the text, e.g., in any figures, axes should be clearly labeled. Please bear in mind also that neither the published or online versions of the *Review* normally can provide figures in color; be sure that a grayscale version will be comprehensible to referees and readers.

Appendices

Appendices should be lettered to distinguish them from numbered tables and figures. Include a descriptive title for each appendix (e.g., "Appendix A: Data Transformation and Estimation").

References

References should be listed in a separate section headed "REFERENCES." All listed references must

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000757 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be cited in the text, and vice versa. Publication information for each reference must be complete and correct.

References should be listed in alphabetical order by authors' last names; include first names and middle initials for all authors when available. For works with more than one author, only the name of the first author is inverted (e.g., "King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba"). List all authors; using "et al." in the reference list is not acceptable.

When the cited material is not yet published but has been accepted for publication, use "Forthcoming" in place of the date and give the journal name or publishing house.

List two or more entries by the same author(s) in the order of the year of publication, and substitute three m-dashes for the author's last name in the second and subsequent entries. If two or more cited works are by the same author(s) within the same year, list them in alphabetical order by title and distinguish them by adding the letters a, b, c, etc., to the year (or to "Forthcoming").

For dissertations and unpublished papers, cite the date and place the paper was presented and/or where it is available. If no date is available, use "n.d." in place of the date.

References for datasets should include a persistent identifier, such as a Digital Object Identifier (DOI). Persistent identifiers ensure future access to unique published digital objects, such as a text or dataset. Persistent identifiers are assigned to datasets by digital archives, such as institutional repositories and partners in the Data Preservation Alliance for the Social Sciences (Data-PASS).

The following list is intended to be illustrative of more common reference types, not exhaustive. For additional reference guidance please see *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th edition.

Books

Ahlquist, John S., and Margaret Levi. 2013. *In the Interest of Others: Leaders, Governance, and Political Activism in Membership Organizations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mansbridge, Jane J. 1986. *Why We Lost the ERA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

U.S. Department of State, 1979. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1951. Vol. II: United Nations; Western Hemisphere*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Periodicals

Gerring, John. 2005a. "Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 17:2 (April):163–98.

Gerring, John. 2005b. "Minor Parties in Plurality Electoral Systems." *Party Politics* 11:1 (January): 79–107.

Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 96:4 (December): 713–28.

Chapter in Edited Collection

Brady, Henry E., and Cynthia S. Kaplan. 2011. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Ethnic Identity." In *Measuring Identity: A Guide for Social Scientists*, eds. Rawi Abdelal, Yoshiko M. Herrera, Alastair Iain Johnston, and Rose McDermott. New York: Cambridge University Press, 33–71.

Edited Collections

Boix, Carles, and Susan C. Stokes, eds. 2007. *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dissertations

Boas, Taylor. 2009. "Varieties of Electioneering: Presidential Campaigns in Latin America." PhD dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

Web sites

American Political Science Association. 2013. "About the APSA Africa Workshops." Washington, DC: American Political Science Association. Retrieved October 10, 2013 (http://www.apsanet.org/~africaworkshops/content_58417.cfm).

Data Sets

Levy, Jack S., and T. Clifton Morgan. *Great Power Wars, 1495–1815*. [Computer file]. ICPSR09955.v1. 1989. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1994. doi: 10.3886/ICPSR09955.v1

Further questions

A list of frequently asked questions and their responses are available at the APSA website at: http://www.apsanet.org/apsr

Do not hesitate, in any cases of doubt, to consult the *APSR* Editorial Offices with more specific questions by sending an e-mail to: apsr@unt.edu

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000757 Published online by Cambridge University Press