doi:10.1017/S0003055416000010
© American Political Science Association 2016

Notes from the Editors

In this issue of the editors' notes, we introduce the new submission guidelines for the *APSR*. Two years ago, in the Fall of 2014, we committed to implementing the guidelines put forward by the Data Access and Research Transparency (DART) Initiative. This process has been ongoing since changes were made to the APSA Ethics Guidelines in 2012 (prior to our taking over as editors of the *APSR*). The new *APSR* submission guidelines have, in part, resulted from that process. However, we have fashioned these guidelines after also consulting with many constituencies in the association, and have carefully taken into consideration the concerns expressed. As a result, we believe that these new *APSR* submission guidelines will better promote transparency than the system we currently use and yet are flexible enough to accommodate various research traditions and approaches. Finally, we believe that it is our responsibility to implement these new guidelines, and this responsibility should not be left to the future editorial team. We will not "kick this down the road."

We do understand, however, that this represents a significant change from what has generally been the practice before, and therefore is an intimidating proposition for many scholars. Indeed, many concerns have been expressed over the past few months, and we have paid close attention to them. We have taken them into account in fashioning these guidelines. Although no set of submission guidelines can address every single circumstance, we believe that the current submission guidelines are flexible enough to address many of the concerns that have been voiced. Most importantly, as we clearly state in the guidelines, we will pay close attention to human subjects concerns, as well as all concerns regarding the need for confidentiality of certain types of evidence. Please note that we have also posted a list of "frequently asked questions" with responses to commonly expressed concerns about the new guidelines. These can be found at http://www.apsanet.org/apsr. We have also generally sought to make it as easy as possible to follow the new guidelines by offering many options for authors to meet the requirements.

In terms of implementation, only those manuscripts we receive after March 1, 2016, will be subject to the new submission guidelines. All those we receive prior to that date will be governed by the previous guidelines. Also please note, we will require that transparency documentation be provided to the *APSR* editors only after a paper has been conditionally accepted but before actual publication. Further, given that these guidelines are new, we will assess the impact of these changes in the future.

And as always, if you have any questions at all about the guidelines, PLEASE DO NOT HESITATE TO CONTACT US at apsr@unt.edu. We will respond to all queries as quickly as possible.

In This Issue

In our lead article, **"Can Employment Reduce Lawlessness and Rebellion? A Field Experiment with High-Risk Men in a Fragile State,"** Christopher Blattman and Jeannie Annan examine the important but underexplored question of what determines the economic fortunes of former combatants in civil wars. Although much of the literature on the reintegration of former combatants speaks to the importance of economic incentives for former combatants to maintain the peace, the literature has generally lacked evidence in support of these remedies. This article provides a level of rigor that has been lacking in the preceding literature on the subject and, as such, represents a significant empirical advance. The authors find that the provision of capital input and skills training has important impacts on the economic prospects of former combatants, and helps to prevent a return to conflict. The analysis is careful and thorough throughout the article, and the complementary qualitative research adds to the plausibility of the interpretations.

In **"Nondomination or Practices of Feedom? French Muslim Women, Foucault, and the Full Veil Ban,"** Inés Valdez opens up a novel approach to understanding the situation of Muslim women who embrace their religious heritage. Using the French debate on *Laïcité*—particularly the French ban on Muslim veiling—Valdez asks whether women who wear veils are necessarily unfree, as the French law presumes. Employing a framework inspired by Foucault, Valdez maintains that no one is truly "liberated," in the sense that no one is free of all social or cultural power. "Freedom" such as we can attain is rather an active engagement with, and acceptance of, such power. Valdez makes the case that at least some Muslim women who wear the veil qualify as free in this sense. They have debated, contested, and sometimes altered Muslim tradition, making the tradition, and the veil, their own. This article will be of great interest to theorists of freedom, of feminism, and of the role of religion in politics.

Leslie Johns and Rachel Wellhausen, in **"Under One Roof: Supply Chains and the Protection of Foreign Investment,"** argue that foreign direct investment is better protected against expropriation when companies establish extensive links with local companies—something that is easier to do for firms that rely on local supply chains. The authors use both quantitative and qualitative evidence to provide support for their argument. Triangulating between these different types of evidence, they show that close connections with local firms in the host country do indeed safeguard foreign investors from contract breach by the host government. Johns and Wellhausen suggest that extensive ties with local companies protect foreign investors, because the government is aware of the harm expropriation could cause to the local companies in the supply chain.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000010 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In **"Beyond Black and White: Biracial Attitudes in Contemporary U.S. Politics,"** Lauren D. Davenport brings together theories from multiple disciplines to explain the attitudes of biracial respondents on racial and nonracial political issues. Davenport utilizes three years of UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute Freshman Surveys augmented with contextual data and in-depth interviews for her analysis She finds clear attitudinal differences among biracials that correspond with their chosen racial labels. For instance, biracials who identify solely as white hold attitudes closer to monoracial whites than biracials who identify as white-black or solely black. However, self-identification alone does not explain social attitudes. Parental characteristics are also shown to have a statistically significant influence on biracial respondents' political views, although the influence of parentage appears to be more prevalent with respect to nonracial issues.

What policy choice does the executive (principal) in a political organization make when her belief regarding the best policy to address an issue differs from the belief of the person responsible for implementing the policy (agent)? How does the agent respond in this situation? To answer these and other questions, in **"Experimentation and Persuasion in Political Organizations"** Alexander V. Hirsch develops a formal principal-agent model of policymaking that differs in several important ways from the classical political agency model. The model emphasizes the importance of learning on the part of the agent as well as experimentation and deference on the part of the principal. Hirsch applies the model to the U.S. federal bureaucracy to produce empirical implications about performance measurement and Presidential appointments in U.S. federal agencies.

In **"Preventing and Responding to Dissent: The Observational Challenges of Explaining Strategic Repression,"** Emily Hencken Ritter and Courtenay R. Conrad note that governments not only respond to overt challenges to their rule, but also violate the rights of citizens to prevent them from engaging in protest and dissent. They use rainfall as an instrument to disentangle the interactive relationship between dissent and repression, arguing that protesters are likely to stay home when it rains but repression continues unabated. This instrument allows Ritter and Conrad to show that, once they take into account the deterrent effect of preventive repression, the relationship between dissent and repression disappears. They suggest avenues to achieve a more precise understanding of the relationship between actual dissent and government behavior.

The study of political rhetoric is undergoing a revival in political science. But what tools should the rhetorician employ, normatively speaking, and by what signs are the public to judge the character and integrity of their leaders? In **"The Rhetoric of Sincerity: Cicero and Smith on Propriety and Political Context,"** Daniel J. Kapust and Michelle A. Schwarze make a case that these two classic political thinkers can instruct us on these questions. Kapust and Schwarze first make the case that existing empirical studies of political rhetoric tend to focus on the competence of leaders, while ignoring integrity as revealed in rhetoric. Yet signaling integrity is one of the key functions of political rhetoric. Integrity is precisely what Cicero and Smith zero in on. Though there are important differences between these two (egalitarianism, for one), Smith's emphasis on *ethos*—allowing the speaker's character to shine forth in rhetoric—and Cicero's use of *decorum* for the same purpose, represent important supplements to contemporary studies of leadership and rhetoric. This article should reopen an old, but recently neglected, horizon for thinking about rhetoric.

Do gender quotas facilitate or undermine the emergence of women into leadership positions within their political party? In **"Gender Quotas and Women's Political Leadership,"** Diana Z. O'Brien and Johanna Rickne use data from Sweden to examine the impact of the imposition of a gender quota on local political party organizations by the national Social Democratic Party in 1994. They find that the quota had a positive impact on women's rise to leadership positions within their party organization. On the basis of their empirical findings, O'Brien and Rickne conclude that quotas enhance the pool of qualified female candidates and accelerate their emergence into party leadership positions.

In **"Religious Minorities and Resistance to Genocide: The Collective Rescue of Jews in the Netherlands during the Holocaust,"** Robert Braun addresses a very interesting question—why do some communities protect persecuted groups during genocide while others do not? Why would a group run the risk of helping victims of genocide or ethnic and racial violence? Braun hypothesizes that religious minority groups are important providers of support because they have sympathy for the persecuted group (or what the author calls commitment) because they too are minorities. Further, because they are minorities they have group cohesion that reduces the risk that their members will defect and rat out others who help the victims. To test this, the author uses geocoded data from the Netherlands during World War II and finds that religious minorities (Protestants in the south of the country and Catholics in the North) were more likely to rescue Jews from the Nazis than the majority Protestants in the North and the majority Catholics in the South.

In the burgeoning academic field of international ethics, one contested point is the extent to which liberal polities should guide their conduct in international relations by liberal principles—and if so, why? Shmuel Nili engages this debate with **"Liberal Integrity and Foreign Entanglement."** He argues that liberal polities have an obligation to follow liberal principles, and in particular to avoid entanglements with regimes that engage in practices that are abhorrent by liberal standards. But—and this is the distinctive twist of the argument—this obligation is largely a self-referential duty. That is, liberal polities *owe it to themselves* to be true to their own character and eschew illiberal entanglements. Nili's article will stimulate much debate on this vital subject of international ethics.

Horacio Larreguy, John Marshall, and Pablo Querubín investigate voter mobilization through the use of hired brokers in Mexican elections in their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000010 Published online by Cambridge University Press

article **"Parties, Brokers, and Voter Mobilization: How Turnout Buying Depends upon the Party's Capacity to Monitor Brokers."** The authors argue that paid brokers are more effective in delivering voter turnout in areas where the party is better able to monitor the brokers. Yet, parties benefit more from engaging such brokers in rural areas where voters face greater difficulties in getting to the polling station—and where it may be more difficult for the party to effectively monitor the broker. Larreguy, Marshall, and Querubín further show that parties benefit differentially from turnout buying; parties that depend more on rural voters stand to gain more from turnout buying.

In the paper **"Deliver the Vote! Micromotives and Macrobehavior in Electoral Fraud,"** Ashlea Rundlett and Milan W. Svolik make a number of counterintuitive propositions regarding election fraud. First, it is often assumed that election fraud is centrally directed by state authorities, and there is conscious manipulation of the results to optimize chances of victory. Second, there is the supposition that fraud occurs most in areas where there is close electoral competition. The authors present a model that provides the logic for why the opposite can be expected. First they argue that the agents engaging in fraud are acting on the behalf of the principal, but the agents have their own incentives—they do not want to get caught committing fraud, because there are observers, and there are punishments (they could be scapegoated as the perpetrators of fraud by the government and "hung out to dry"). Thus the authors argue that fraud is much more prevalent in areas that are solidly progovernment than in areas that are competitive. They test these propositions using precinct-level election data from the latest Russian elections in 2011–2012.

In **"Targeted for Diffusion? How the Use and Acceptance of Stereotypes Shape the Diffusion of Criminal Justice Policy Innovations in the American States,"** Graeme Boushey utilizes data from 48 years of newspaper articles covering the adoption of 44 different state criminal justice policies to examine the mechanisms of criminal justice policy diffusion in the United States. In doing so, he tests key propositions of Schneider and Ingram's (1993; 2005) highly influential policy design framework and finds strong support for their central idea that congruent policies, which reinforce popular stereotypes, diffuse more readily than noncongruent policies that challenge biases over who is deserving of policy intervention. Contrary to the expectations in past literature (including Schneider and Ingram 1993), however, he finds little evidence that the competitiveness or timing of state elections leads legislatures to adopt congruent "tough on crime" policy reforms.

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

[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/S0003055416000010 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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@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

[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/S0003055416000010 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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.

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

[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/S0003055416000010 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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").

References

References should be listed in a separate section headed "REFERENCES." All listed references must be cited in the text, and vice versa. Publication

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000010 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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: Interuniversity 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/S0003055416000010 Published online by Cambridge University Press