American Political Science Review (2017) 111, 2, iii–x
doi:10.1017/S0003055417000065
© American Political Science Association 2017

Notes from the Editor

In this issue's Notes from the Editors, we are excited to be able to present not only our first big innovation for the *American Political Science Review*, our *letter* format, but also articles that are concurrent with present political affairs, a difficult task due to the intricacies of peer reviewed science. We would first like to draw attention to our new publication format, *letters*. We hope to further the idea of publishing important insights to research problems in political science and encourage scholarly debate in the discipline. Some of these insights, however, might not fit in the traditional, longer *article* format, which is tailored to original work advancing the understanding of political issues that are of general interest to the field of political science. Instead, letters provide an opportunity to report about original research that moves the subfields of political science forward as they develop alongside their counterparts in related disciplines, such as new theoretical perspectives, methodological progress, alternative empirical findings, as well as comments on and extensions of existing work. Moreover, our letter format attempts to increase inter-disciplinary recognition by broadening readership and eventually authorship from scholars of other disciplines that address an important research problem in political science.

Because we expect *letters* to remain a maximum length of 4,000 words, they are intended to be much more focused on one important result. *Letters* should be clear in their contribution, meaning that they should not include a long literature review that is standard in *article* manuscripts. Rather, *letters* should have a briefer introduction, motivation, analysis, and conclusion. Furthermore, depending on the field, they will typically include few figures and tables that directly communicate the new insights and the main takeaways from the research. We hope that this new format will stimulate scholarly discussion and disseminate findings that would otherwise be ignored in- and outside political science.

Additionally, political science research is often criticized for not being contemporaneous with current events. This is not only an inherent problem of political science research but of research in general, which attempts to produce valid inferences on complex, sometimes unique phenomena in a systematic manner. This is further complicated by the need for rigorous peer-review. The APSR review process begins after a manuscript has had an internal check for formatting and content. Reviewers then have 30 days to provide detailed recommendations on how to improve the manuscript. When granted, the author is given an opportunity to revise and resubmit. This manuscript is usually re-evaluated by the same reviewers and the process may repeat itself as many times as reviewers and editors see fit. After completion of this revision period, the editors start a careful deliberation process about publication—in our case with a proposal of the associate editor that needs approval by the lead editor. Sometimes this requires a further round of reviews and deliberation before an accepted manuscript enters the production process that requires a back and forth of proofs until the manuscript is ready for publication. This is a very time consuming and labor intensive process. As a response to the slow nature of peer-review, publishers introduced online, preprint publication as a way to expedite the publication process. Following this trend, the APSR has recently started publishing articles online prior to issue publication with Cambridge University Press's FirstView.[1]

This brings us to our latest issue, which contains a series of articles that provide novel insights into current political phenomena. We lead off with an article on "taking sides," which introduces a novel perspective on third party intervention in conflict. We follow with an article that evaluates the implications of cyclical violence on elections. Two articles illuminate the hotly debated issue on immigration from different perspectives; one, a social integrationist perspective on naturalization, and the other, a biological behavioral view of disgust. This is complemented by an article on the necessity of trust and distrust in the democratic process from Bentham's perspective and an article on political ambition of Xenophon's Cyrus; both of which make us re-evaluate our understanding of distrust and ambition in our governments and leaders today. Post-Soviet Russia is another focus of two articles in this issue; one evaluates cascading party defection from the Russia United Party and the other assesses firms' use of legal strategies over violence and corruption. Furthermore, this issue includes an article on how closeness to core individuals in networks can positively affect party support while another shows how periphery mobilization rather than core activists drove the Arab Spring. The penultimate article looks into the effectiveness of governmental nudging. Our final article explores the founding of the U.S. Constitution and why we should view it as a corporate charter as opposed to a social contract. We want to thank the authors, the reviewers, and all the other actors who contributed to these excellent articles from initial submission to print.

There are multiple examples of third parties intervening in wars of attrition, such as Russia's intervention in the Syrian civil war on the side of Assad's government, or the United Kingdom's, France's, and the United States' intervention in the Libyan civil war. Addressing the dynamics of these recent conflicts, Robert Powell, in "Taking Sides in Wars of Attrition," introduces a novel framework to model third party intervention in civil or interstate war. By analyzing

[1] We invite you to visit https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/firstview for our latest FirstView articles.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

how an intervening third party affects duration and outcome in a two-actor conflict, Powell, among other things, identifies what he calls a "boomerang effect" of third-party intervention: Whenever a third party's preference for one side over the other is not too large and fighting is costly, alignment decisions become unpredictable and coalitions dynamically unstable. We believe that his theoretical model is a major advancement and will contribute to the literature on interstate and intrastate wars but also stimulate some interesting debate beyond.

Elections are supposed to be nonviolent means for power transition, yet, they are often accompanied by violent political events. However, in "The Political Violence Cycle," S. P. Harish and Andrew T. Little argue that this empirical relationship is tautological; instead, it is more interesting to consider the overall level of political violence to understand the relationship between elections and violence. Comparing the average level of violence with that of a counterfactual world without elections, they show that the spikes of political violence around elections do not imply that elections cause more political violence overall. Perhaps most important to their argument is that because political violence is a valuable tool in inciting political change, violence can decrease in periods between elections to be more effective during elections. Harish and Little's discussion of the empirical implications of their modeling provides helpful guidance for future empirical testing.

Whether and how fast states should grant citizenship to facilitate social integration of immigrants is politically highly contested. In their study, "Catalyst or Crown: Does Naturalization Promote the Long-Term Social Integration of Immigrants?," Jens Hainmueller, Dominik Hangartner, and Giuseppe Pietrantuono provide novel causal estimates to shed light on this pressing policy issue. They exploit the quasi-random assignment of citizenship in Switzerland where municipalities used referendums to decide on naturalization applications. Their results show that naturalization can indeed function as a strong catalyst for long-term social integration success which goes beyond economic and political integration. Interestingly, the effects prove to be strongest for more marginalized immigrant groups and those who naturalize earlier. It stands in contrast to proponents in favor of restricting access to citizenship to only those immigrants who successfully completed the integration process. This suggests that countries with restrictive naturalization regimes can actually benefit from their citizenship policies when full integration occurs by simply reducing lengthy residency requirements and stringent naturalization criteria.

In their study, "The Behavioral Immune System Shapes Political Intuitions: Why and How Individual Differences in Disgust Sensitivity Underlie Opposition to Immigration," Lene Aarøe, Michael Bang Petersen, and Kevin Arceneaux argue that opposition to immigration arises not only from sociotropic and economic concerns but also from deeper subconscious psychological predispositions. They put forward an evolutionary perspective on disgust which posits that, from a biological stance, disgust began as a reaction designed to protect humans from pathogenic threats, which in turn motivated avoidance of potentially infected beings. As a result, people with higher disgust sensitivity are more likely to oppose immigration because they subconsciously associate outgroups with a higher contamination risk. Observational and experimental studies from the United States and Denmark provide empirical support for their theory. This is a fascinating finding given how the staggering rise of anti-immigration sentiments in the United States and several European countries has subsequently altered today's political environment. The study advances our understanding of how emotions can affect not only attitudes towards immigration, but our entire ideological belief system.

In his essay, "Vigilance and Confidence: Jeremy Bentham, Publicity, and the Dialectic of Political Trust and Distrust," Jonathan R. Bruno discusses the role of trust in public authorities for democratic politics, which has eroded over recent decades. He identifies two perspectives in the work of the utilitarian political philosopher Jeremy Bentham. For Bentham, distrust is not the absence of trust and Bruno argues that Bentham's work highlights the complementarity of both. Political distrust promotes attentive citizens to work as safeguards against abuses of power, whereas particularized political trust in institutions and representatives, which have proven themselves worthy, facilitates and fosters good governance in favor of the public interest. In times when citizens' political distrust seems to prevail and citizens increasingly fall for antiestablishment and populist parties and politicians, Bruno's essay makes us remember that both an excess and deficit of either trust or distrust can be very harmful for democratic governance.

In her well-written essay, "Xenophon on the Psychology of Supreme Political Ambition," Lorraine Smith Pangle explores and discusses the nature and roots of political ambition as presented in Xenophon's Cyropaedia. While quantitative political scientists mainly rely on demographic features and political values that opinion surveys can capture to approximate one's ambition, she investigates the writings of the Socratic student Xenophon. It offers a constant exploration of Cyrus's high political ambition as the wish to be a godlike benefactor. Pangle, therefore, makes us reflect on the motives that may drive the ambition of people being both noble in nature, yet, easily oppressive in its outcome. We think her careful and persuasive analysis breaks new ground in the study on the Cyropaedia and the understanding of political ambition more generally.

In "Who Defects? Unpacking a Defection Cascade from Russia's Dominant Party 2008–12," Henry E. Hale and Timothy J. Colton examine the thresholds at which people remove their support from dominant parties in nondemocratic regimes. They take advantage of an original panel survey measuring individuals' support for Vladimir Putin's United Russia Party in the period before and after the dramatic defection cascade between 2008 and 2012. When support for a regime party drops, it may result in a dramatic cascade that can threaten the survival of the regime. Their study constitutes a successful empirical analysis of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

microfoundations of regime defection processes, which also identifies the specific preferences and thresholds that move such defections. They find that early defectors are found among the less socially vulnerable parts of society, rely less on other people for interpreting events, believe the regime has lower levels of popular support, and come from more heterogeneous communities. Against common wisdom, it suggests that defection from Russia's dominant party had little to do with democratization and mass media reportage, including patterns of social media use and consumption of information from more independent outlets

When do firms rely on and use state institutions instead of violence and corruption to ensure the protection of their property? In "Demand for Law and the Security of Property Rights: The Case of Post-Soviet Russia," Jordan Gans-Morse identifies three factors that influence the degree to which firms employ legal strategies, namely firm-level practices and beliefs, effectiveness of illegal strategies, and coordination problems with other firms. He illustrates his formalized theoretical argument with a detailed study of firm strategies for securing property in Post-Soviet Russia. Moving beyond supply side explanations, this study provides novel insights about state building in the context of legal and economic institutions and offers an explanation as to why some institutional reforms fall short of their good intentions when governments don't take the social environment into account.

In their innovative study, "It's Not Just What You Have, but Who You Know: Networks, Social Proximity to Elites, and Voting in State and Local Elections," Matthew T. Pietryka and Donald A. DeBats collected two original historical datasets on state and local elections to analyze how the social proximity of voters to elites affects turnout and vote choice. Extending the literature that focuses largely on personal attributes, they find that the likelihood for voting increases with the social proximity to elites. Moreover, individuals who are more socially proximate to elites from a particular party are more likely to vote for that party over their opponents.

In "Spontaneous Collective Action: Peripheral Mobilization During the Arab Spring," Zachary C. Steinert-Threlkeld highlights the role of individuals in the periphery of social networks for the success of protest mobilization. Following the idea of "the strength of weak ties," he proposes a novel theory of "spontaneous collective action," arguing that peripheral members of a network drive coordination without a central leadership because they provide a credible signal about participation and information provision. An analysis of protests during the Arab Spring combined with a Twitter-based measure of protest coordination provides systematic evidence for his hypothesis. The study successfully demonstrates how big data can help us understand processes of social behavior and mobilization in more temporal detail.

Nudging policies have become increasingly popular among governments by adjusting the set of available options in order to influence people's choices. We have seen such nudging policies, for example, when governments move from opt-in to opt-out systems, like organ donation and retirement savings. In his essay, "The Power to Nudge," Andreas T. Schmidt defends the idea of nudging against widespread "objection from alien control" believing that it leads to an increase of uncontrolled power over people. Instead, he argues that systematic public policy nudging can, in fact, increase democratic control *vis-à-vis* private agents, who use uncontrolled nudges. However, it necessitates that such policies are suitably transparent and under democratic control. His well-argued essay will stipulate those interested in the debate on nudging but also scholars concerned with democratic control of public policy.

In "Is the U.S. Government a Corporation? The Corporate Origins of Modern Constitutionalism," David Ciepley argues that the U.S. constitution is better understood as a corporate charter rather than a "social contract." His analysis of the Federalist papers builds on corporation theory, which has primarily been used to investigate the impact of the corporate form on business. Ciepley shows how corporate principles and practices governing the American colonies constituted and produced the mode of U.S. constitutionalism with its three key components: popular sovereignty, a written constitution, and judicial review. The Federalists applied this corporate governance technology to establish the constitutional state by substituting the people in for the King as the chartering sovereign. Ciepley's original argument provides an alternative perspective on how we think about what a constitution is and where constitutional conflicts come from.

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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.[2]

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 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).[3] 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

[2] 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

[3] 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.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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.[4]

- 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).[5] 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.[6]
- 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

[4] 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.

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

[6] 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/

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

policy as the journal *Behavior Genetics*[7]. 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 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

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 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.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/S0003055417000065 Published online by Cambridge University Press