American Political Science Review (2017) 111, 3, iii–ix
doi:10.1017/S0003055417000181 © American Political Science Association 2017

Notes from the Editor

In this issue's *Notes from the Editor*, we are pleased to announce our collaboration with Overleaf, a cloud-based LaTeX editor, which makes writing, editing, and submitting manuscripts quicker and easier for authors using LaTeX. After having implemented FirstView and a new format of *Letters*, we are currently preparing to release our LaTeX template with Overleaf. Our goal is to improve our services to our contributors by facilitating easy online manuscript preparation, editing, and one-click submission directly into our managing system, Editorial Manager. We believe that this new tool is particularly helpful for collaborations, which have increasingly grown to characterize the bulk of APSR submissions. Our aim is to serve the changing needs of our contributors with the most effective solutions, and to fulfill our core purpose of encouraging academic collaboration while improving our service to our contributors.

This brings us to our latest issue, which contains a series of articles that apply new tools to the analysis of current political phenomena. In their article "Days of Action or Restraint? How the Islamic Calendar Impacts Violence," Michael J. Reese, Keven G. Ruby, and Robert A. Pape provide new insights into the debate on whether political violence escalates or declines during religious holidays. They argue that during major Islamic holidays, insurgents restrain their use of violence because they anticipate that violence during these periods would result in broad societal disapproval. Using qualitative evidence and five separate datasets of daily incidents of political violence in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan covering a ten-year period, Reese and his co-authors show that violence substantially declines during major Islamic religious holidays in all three countries. This does not apply to public holidays in general, or to religious holidays without days off, or the month of Ramadan, and is not driven by weather or other annual cycles that might affect the costs and benefits of violence. Their innovative study provides new evidence that the Islamic calendar acts as a force for peace because militants fear public outrage in response to using violence on important religious holidays.

During a time at which our world and our communities are coming to terms with unprecedented differences, we offer two articles which apply the history of Western political thought to examine how such differences might be constructively engaged. In "Montesquieu's Teaching on the Dangers of Extreme Corrections: Japan, the Catholic Inquisition, and Moderation in *The Spirit of the Laws*," Nathaniel Gilmore and Vickie B. Sullivan revisit Montesquieu's well-known work, *The Spirit of the Laws*, to argue that, far from praising European polities for their moderation in contrast to the "despotism" of eastern regimes, in that text "Montesquieu finds the extremes of inhumanity in the pursuit of correction at opposite points of the globe." In doing so, they argue, Montesquieu reveals the cruelty involved in humanity's extreme desires for correcting wickedness. In the face of such extremity, which remains with us today, the authors argue that Montesquieu counsels moderation—in both his reserved method of documenting such cruelty, and the substance of his response to it.

"Foreigners as Liberators: Education and Cultural Diversity in Plato's *Menexenus*" by Rebecca LeMoine investigates the nature of Plato's xenophobia. Contrary to most scholarship that sees Plato as dismissing cultural diversity, LeMoine argues that once the dramatic context of Platonic dialogues such as the *Menexenus* are taken into account, Plato can be seen as offering a virtue-based defense of it. Voicing a funeral oration through the voice of Aspasia, Pericles' foreign mistress, Plato incites his interlocutors to think about speech from the perspective of a foreigner and so cultivates awareness of the limits of our knowledge and wisdom. In doing so, Plato suggests that foreigners play the role of gadflies in healthy democracies, exhorting citizens to care more about their virtues resolving societal conflict through education.

One manifestation of 'big data' are massive data leaks, such as the Panama Papers or the US embassy cables. "How the Chinese Government Fabricates Social Media Posts for Strategic Distraction, Not Engaged Argument" by Gary King, Jennifer Pan, and Margaret E. Roberts is centered on the analysis of a large, leaked email archive from the Internet Propaganda Office of Zhanggong in China. The study illustrates how to use a massive data leak to answer social science questions, which includes challenges of data preparation and validation strategies for descriptive and causal inference. The archive is used to estimate the degree to which social media posts in China are written by so-called 50-cent (50c) party members, which received the name because they purportedly get 50 cents per online post to support the government. The authors analyze the posts with a sophisticated mix of manual, qualitative analysis, and machine learning techniques. They find that most posts are about cheerleading and creating a positive image of the government and their follow-up survey validates the degree to which posts have been written by 50c members, which leads the authors to infer that about half a billion posts per year are fabricated by them. While this article presents further insight into information control through distraction in China, we expect to see this research expanded to investigate other regimes.

The analysis of networks holds great promises for a better understanding of political and social collective action. Political networks were first investigated with (expert) surveys. In recent years, scholars started turning to online social network data to examine network theories and such studies gained particular popularity with the availability of online social network data. However, it creates the question to what extent insights

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000181 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from online networks can be generalized to offline networks, which are the subject of many collective action theories. In the article "Testing Social Science Network Theories with Online Network Data: An Evaluation of External Validity," James Bisbee and Jennifer M. Larson test whether inferences derived from online data are similar to conclusions derived from offline data. Using a survey experiment, Bisbee and Larson implement a complex and sophisticated design allowing them to test for external validity on multiple dimensions and for multiple outcomes. They find that features of online and offline networks are statistically indistinguishable. Their analysis presents evidence that theories about offline collective action can indeed be tested with online data. We, therefore, expect the article to lay important foundations for future testing of political science theories with online network data.

In "Between Means and Ends: Reconstructing Coercion in Dewey's Democratic Theory," Alexander Livingston argues that Dewey offers a middle way between, on the one hand, an amoral political realism that justifies means in terms of ends and, on the other hand, ethical purism with which he and his pragmatism is often associated. Rather, Livingston's careful textual and historical exegesis of Dewey explores the possibilities of what Livingston calls "non-deliberative means of political action, such as disruption, non-cooperation, and coercion" to transform society democratically and toward democratic ends. Showcasing an extensive engagement with Dewey's work and activism, Livingston simultaneously contributes to literature in democratic theory, the history of American thought, and pragmatist political philosophy.

In "Process or Candidate: The International Community and the Demand for Electoral Integrity," Johannes Bubeck and Nikolay Marinov explore the incentives of outside powers to intervene in democratic elections. The authors distinguish between a mix of geo-political and liberalism concerns of outside powers, which establish an incentive structure for investing in candidates, democratic processes, or both. After exploring the consequences of a single foreign intervener who supports either the democratic process or preferred candidates, as a function of her preference over the election alternatives and commitment to electoral integrity, the analysis turns to the interactions between multiple outside actors with different preferences engaged in "election wars." They show how this perspective on the preferences and actions available to outside states can explain a variety of empirical patterns in such interventions, including seemingly incongruous instances of illiberal states engaging in democracy promotion abroad. As both the authors and reviewers noted, there is significant potential for further research exploring variations on this model, several of which they explore in the article and, given the timeliness of the subject matter, we expect that scholars will quickly seek to explore how the authors' conclusions respond to further variations.

In "Electoral Accountability for State Legislative Roll Calls and Ideological Representation," Steven Rogers makes a major contribution to the study of electoral accountability in US state legislatures. Using a new and comprehensive collection of district-level measures of public opinion covering all states for a full decade, he assesses the extent to which US state legislators are held accountable when they cast specific unpopular roll-call votes or more generally are ideologically out of step with their constituency. While he does find evidence of non-zero accountability, the extent to which state legislators are held accountable in this way is weaker than for the US Congress. In addition to enabling this novel comparison of accountability at the federal and state level, Rogers is able to examine a rich set of interactions with media density, legislative staff ratios, and other factors that seem to shape accountability. Overall, Rogers provides the first comprehensive demonstration that electoral accountability for state legislator roll-call behavior in the US is weak in absolute terms, relative to federal accountability, as well as relative to other known influences on state legislative elections.

In "Childhood Skill Development and Adult Political Participation," John B. Holbein provides a new lens on the aspects of childhood that shape political socialization and engagement of adults. To establish a causal connection between the psychological attributes that children develop and their levels of adult voter participation, the author leverages data of the Fast Track intervention—a multi-site field experiment that was designed as a clustered random trial to improve the psychosocial skills ("children's emotion regulation and social-cognitive skills") of a cohort of high-risk children, who were starting grade school in the early 1990s. Through a theoretical logic of why these non-cognitive psychosocial skills might affect the ability and inclination of individuals to engage with the political system, Holbein demonstrates that there is evidence of positive effects of these early childhood interventions on voter turnout two decades later. The mediation analysis is consistent with the primary mechanism indeed being the targeted psychosocial skills, and their downstream consequences in adolescence and early adulthood. These findings are relevant both to ongoing debates in education about the cost effectiveness of these kinds of interventions, as well as providing a rare experimental lens onto political socialization. While this is not the first study of political participation to take advantage of an existing early-life intervention study, the content of that intervention makes this a particularly revealing and important study.

Voting is one of the central forms of political action in a democracy. The article "Voter Registration Costs and Disenfranchisement: Experimental Evidence from France," by Céline Braconnier, Jean-Yves Dormagen, and Vincent Pons, studies whether and to what extent voter registration requirements impede turnout. To answer this research question, they used the French presidential election of 2012 to set up a large-scale field experiment involving 20,500 households split into a control and six treatment groups. Canvassing visits of treatment groups either informed households about the election or helped them register, while treatment groups varied depending the time and frequency of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000181 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the visits. The authors then engaged in extensive post-election data collection to determine whether participants did cast their vote. The study shows that registration visits are effective because they increase turnout and increase political interest. As the reviewers point out, this study is an excellent example of a well-designed and executed field experiment.

Many revolutions, including the Mexican of 1910—1920, the Russian of 1917, and the Iranian of 1979, followed a period of economic growth and prosperity. Having made this seemingly paradoxical observation for the French revolution of 1789, 18th century political scientist Alexis de Tocqueville made the famous claim that the main threat to a political system comes from the middle class. He argues that this social group becomes particularly frustrated by the gap between their rising aspirations triggered by improving economic conditions and their actual living standard. In their study, "Economic Development, Mobility, and Political Discontent: An Experimental Test of Tocqueville's Thesis in Pakistan," Andrew Healy, Katrina Kosec, and Cecilia Hyunjung Mo take a closer look at the mechanism behind the "Tocqueville effect," namely the idea that increasing economic development can generate political discontent. They provide a lucid formal model to capture Tocqueville's verbal theory. The authors test the theoretical predictions in a survey experiment in Pakistan—a country with high inter-generational mobility but a fragile security situation. In line with the theory, their results indicate that individuals who have high aspirations show most eroding government support or political discontent when made to feel relatively poor and economically immobile.

How do we explain variation in state development and prosperity, the wealth of nations, and their institutions? These are some of the big questions in political science and with substantial relevance for modern societies and economies. In their article, "Geography, Transparency, and Institutions," Joram Mayshar, Omer Moav, and Zvika Neeman contribute to this ongoing debate on the emergence of state institutions. They propose an argument that traces back property rights over land, within-state distribution of power, and scale of ancient states to, ultimately, geographic and technological conditions of a society. The authors test this theory by examining some of the very early institutions in ancient agrarian societies where land was the main capital asset. Their argument is subtle: Whether institutions are more or less extractive and whether central governments are strong or weak, is largely determined by the extent of the information asymmetry between the ruler and the subordinate with respect to the production process. In areas where rulers know whether a bad harvest is due to bad weather conditions or lazy subordinates, rulers extract more and property rights are less secure. By contrast, if production is opaque, the dismissal of farmers does not pay off and rulers grant farmers *de facto* property rights over the land they cultivate. The theory is developed into a principal-agent model and illustrated with three cases studies of institutional evolution in Ancient Egypt, Southern Mesopotamia, and Northern Mesopotamia.

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 the 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

[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/S0003055417000181 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 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@mail.uni-mannheim.de.

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]

[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/S0003055417000181 Published online by Cambridge University Press

- 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: 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.

[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/

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.

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000181 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 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").

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000181 Published online by Cambridge University Press

References

References should be listed in a separate section headed "REFERENCES." All listed references must 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@mail.uni-mannheim.de.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000181 Published online by Cambridge University Press