American Political Science Review (2017) 111, 4, iii–x
doi:10.1017/S0003055417000417
© American Political Science Association 2017

Notes from the Editors

On August 25, 2016, we started our editorship of the *Review*. During these first ten months, we processed a record high number of submissions—999 new manuscripts, 92 revisions, and 157 manuscripts already under review from the previous team. In addition to introducing early online publication through FirstView and *Letters* as a new publication format, we changed the editorial process to reduce turnaround duration and reviewer fatigue. For the first time since 2012/13, the time spent from submission to editor decision decreased. We also decided to increase the amount of desk rejections which further reduced overall turnaround times and increased the share of invited reviewers per manuscript. We note that the increase in desk rejections was compensated by a decrease of rejections after review.

Compared to these encouraging numbers, the distribution of submissions and acceptances across fields and methods remained relatively stable. Comparative politics papers still dominate our submission sample, followed by american politics, normative political theory, and international relations. Quantitative studies lead in terms of approach, but interpretative studies come second, followed by qualitative and formal studies at much lower levels. We also observe that the share of male contributions is slightly decreasing and compensated by submissions from mixed gender teams of authors.

Apart from these numbers, which we will provide in more detail in our Editorial Report as part of our promise to increase transparency of the editorial process, we notice a declining trend in the two-year impact factor of the *Review*. Over time, FirstView should help to change this declining visibility trend, which started after 2012. On closer inspection, we also find that the five-year impact factor of the *Review* continues to rise and that our pluralist publication strategy, which includes publishing in all subfields and methods in political science, increases the long-term visibility of our publications.

We have received applause and criticism in the past ten months of our editorship. Unsurprisingly, these two kinds of responses highly correlate with outcomes, but we intend to continue with our transparency policy, which includes the provision of data and materials of *APSR* articles. We continue to collaborate with APSA and Cambridge University Press to incorporate tools which may increase transparency and ease of use of our publications, such as Overleaf and Dataverse. We are curious about how our authors respond to these innovations, as we already observe an increasing number of *letters* submissions, which may also expand our interdisciplinary author- and readership.

This issue starts off with an article tackling the role of the middle class in democratization. The following article then examines the different dynamics of voter turnout in new democracies. We move on to articles on state development more generally examining various questions concerning the importance of institutions as well as the reasons for unfinished development projects more specifically. After learning about a new interpretation of Habermas's perspective on religion, the following articles deal with aspects of partisanship both from a conceptual perspective as well as from an empirical perspective on policy uptake. The next article presents novel empirical evidence on the question of economic voting. We have three distinctive articles on violence and conflict, ranging from explaining redemptive violence in Jacobin political thought, the effects of mass killings on property transfers, and a new understanding Kant's anticolonialism as securing peace in Europe and not for humanitarian reasons. Our final piece, which is the first *letter* we are publishing, introduces a new tool to help researchers use crowdsourced coding and measures of political texts.

A rising middle class has been associated with democratization, but the literature is limited concerning which middle class groups contribute most toward that goal, especially in nondemocratic settings. In her study, "Reevaluating the Middle-Class Protest Paradigm: A Case-Control Study of Democratic Protest Coalitions in Russia," Bryn Rosenfeld argues that by splitting the middle class into state- and private-sector workers, we can disentangle countries which are more likely to experience democratization and those not. Pivotal to her argument is the condition that state-dependent workers weaken support for democratization, especially in countries with a large public sector. Using surveys conducted in Russia during mass demonstrations after the 2011–2012 elections and population data, her results show that public-sector workers were less likely to mobilize, even when controlling for ideology. Not only does she introduce a new approach to studying protests in case-control methods of epidemiology, but also the implications of her research, that the middle class can have a much more diverse effect on democratization than previously believed, could have profound effects for the stability of authoritarian regimes and democratization in general.

Evidence since 1939 questions whether democratic consolidation is the culprit of global declines in voter turnout. In "Does Democratic Consolidation Lead to a Decline in Voter Turnout? Global Evidence Since 1939," a study of worldwide legislative elections between 1939 and 2015, Filip Kostelka argues against this perspective by disentangling the various dynamics of voting rates in new democracies and comparing them to similar dynamics in established democracies. In a democratization context, he contends, there is a surge of voter turnout that subsides over time as its salience decreases and the rates return to a normal baseline. In terms of democratic consolidation, voter turnout decreases occur only in postcommunist countries. Finally, he demonstrates that new democracies only mirror their established counterparts, which have been have experienced declining voting rates since the 1970s.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000417 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In U.S. federal and state constitutions, the separation of power is very pronounced with governors and assemblies having independent power bases. How did this hallmark of U.S. constitutions evolve? In his thought-provoking article, "Building a New Imperial State: The Strategic Foundations of Separation of Powers in America," Sean Gailmard argues that to understand the origins of separation of powers in the U.S. we must look at the era of English colonies in North America. He argues that what nowadays is a natural institution, is the result of an institutional choice of a strategic English crown confronted with agency problems. To develop the argument, Gailmard sets up a formal model with repeated interactions of the crown, the governor, and the settlers. Interestingly, the model suggests that separation of powers was neither invoked to control the crown (by an assembly), nor invented by the crown to tie its own hands, but designed to empower settlers to restrain the governor. Why was this distinct form of a separation of powers unique to North America? The model suggests that unlike colonies that provided opportunities for natural resource extraction, economic growth in the North American colonies required investments of settlers in agriculture. In a broader perspective, Gailmard offers a new way of looking at the evolution of an important institution—a perspective that will certainly be taken up by research in a range of other, colonial or authoritarian, contexts of institutional choice.

Powersharing institutions are often proposed to stabilize countries recovering from armed conflict or those with deeply divided societies. Yet, we have little systematic evidence on what types of powersharing successfully foster democratic stability under different scenarios. In their article, "Safeguarding Democracy: Powersharing and Democratic Survival," Benjamin A.T. Graham, Michael K. Miller, and Kaare W. Strøm identify and distinguish between inclusive, dispersive, and constraining *de jure* powersharing institutions. Outlining their distinctive impact on democratic legitimacy and accountability, the authors derive specific expectations of how each type of powersharing is likely to affect democratic survival in general, but also in particular in postconflict societies. Using a global dataset from 1975–2010, their analyses show that only constraining powersharing, such as independent judiciaries and strong protections of civil rights and liberties, fosters democratic survival in all analyzed political contexts. Dispersive powersharing is shown to be harmful to democratic survival in postconflict societies, while inclusive powersharing improves the chances of democratic survival in such contexts. Their study highlights the importance of carefully differentiating and theorizing the impact of different policy instruments under various contexts, as the one-size-fits-all approach is not only ineffective but might even have a detrimental impact on societies.

Launching development projects is a popular endeavor among donor and recipient countries, but only a fraction of them is finished. The article, "The Political Economy of Unfinished Development Projects: Corruption, Clientelism, or Collective Choice?," by Martin J. Williams derives observable implications from three competing explanations to improve our understanding of this phenomenon, namely whether unfinished projects in developing countries are a product of corruption in implementing the public services, misallocation of public expenditure, or the result of a collective choice process where political actors face commitment problems due to limited resources. The explanations are tested against an original dataset comprising information on 14,000 small-scale projects in Ghana. The author draws on rich qualitative knowledge about politics and decision making in Ghana and runs a series of models to comparatively test the three explanatory accounts. The study finds that collective choice processes suffering from inconsistencies account best for the data. While these findings have theoretical consequences, the practical consequences truly highlight the importance of this research, i.e., the extent to which wasteful expenditure in areas that need services harms communities and the impact of improved fiscal institution can have on monitoring project completion and mindful spending can have in these settings.

In his article, "Taking Religion Seriously? Habermas on Religious Translation and Cooperative Learning in Post-secular Society," Giorgi Areshidze supports an innovative and challenging new interpretation of Habermas with a sympathetic and nuanced example of religious reasoning in public space. Areshidze examines Habermas's recent attempt to "take religion seriously" by treating religious claims as potentially meaningful truths for public discussion. He argues, however, that although Habermas's views do important work in laying bare the foundationalism (and what Areshidze calls the "theologically transformative presuppositions") of Rawlsian liberalism, they, too, fail to consider how religious truths can be "lost in translation" as they are forced to articulate their views within "post-secular" societies. As an example of such translation issues, Areshidze examines Catholic reasons for supporting religious freedom, arguing that despite some overlap with secular justifications these reasons nevertheless are not exhausted by them.

Parties and partisanship have been subject of empirical research for decades. Recently, partisanship also became an increasingly important topic in normative political theory. A central line of research is about how partisanship can contribute to the functioning of a liberal democracy. While this is an important normative discussion in its own right, the criteria that are developed on the relationship between partisanship and liberal democracy are too unspecific to be used as benchmarks in empirical research. The article by Lise Ester Herman, "Democratic Partisanship: From Theoretical Ideal to Empirical Standard," sets out to remedy this shortcoming. She develops a theoretical and conceptual framework that has "cohesiveness" and "respect for political pluralism" as the two main dimensions. Both dimensions are operationalized via multiple indicators whose benefit for empirical research is illustrated in the article.

Partisanship predicts a variety of political attitudes and different forms of political behavior. The article, "Policy Uptake as Political Behavior: Evidence

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000417 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from the Affordable Care Act," by Amy E. Lerman, Meredith L. Sadin, and Samuel Trachtman goes beyond existing research on partisanship by asking whether partisanship also explains policy uptake. Focusing on the United States, they examine whether Republicans and Democrats show different behavior in relation to Obamacare. The empirical analysis has two components. First, using longitudinal observational data, the authors show that Democrats are more likely to enroll in an insurance plan than Republicans. Second, in a large-scale field experiment, they analyze the mechanisms of policy uptake and find that the way in which Obamacare is described affects policy uptake. Altogether, the article indicates that partisanship plays an important role in U.S. politics, influencing how citizens respond to the opportunities that a policy offers.

Does the state of the economy influence voting behavior? In the article "Digging into the Pocketbook: Evidence on Economic Voting from Income Registry Data Matched to a Voter Survey," Andrew J. Healy, Mikael Persson, and Erik Snowberg seek to answer this question by drawing on a unique Swedish dataset linking personal income records with a representative election survey. This gives the authors the opportunity to comparatively test arguments about sociotropic voting against arguments centered on pocketbook voting. The study points to the benefits of combining both data sources because the combination offers a better assessment of the argument that the economy is the more important driving force of voting behavior. Both explanations of voting seem to be equally relevant. Moreover, the study presents new insights on the sources of bias in economic evaluations and the question of whether income changes early or late in the government's term matter more.

Kevin Duong turns to revolutionary French history as a means of extending disciplinary conversations about violence and sovereignty in his article, "The People as a Natural Disaster: Redemptive Violence in Jacobin Political Thought." Examining the trial and execution of Louis XVI in 1792, Duong draws on both image and text to suggest that the lack of legal precedent for regicide prompts Jacobin thinkers to tie the king's execution to a new exercise of popular agency—a form of "redemptive violence" that simultaneously dissolves the social body while reconstituting it. This article thus offers an outstanding example of how careful examination of a historical event can contribute to political theorizing that is both historically sensitive while offering lessons of contemporary relevance.

Volha Charnysh and Evgeny Finkel develop an interesting and carefully crafted research design to study an under-researched question: How do mass killings affect local property transfers? In their article, "The Death Camp Eldorado: Political and Economic Effects of Mass Violence," they choose the Treblinka death camp in Poland to study the redistribution of wealth from the Jewish victims to the population living in the vicinity, due to the exogenous placement of the death camp and absence of alternative explanations for such property transfers in this case. Charnysh and Finkel create an original historical dataset on various luxury goods, productive assets, and housing to assess economic redistribution. Their results reveal that these property transfers had a highly localized impact and led to investments in new and better homes in the vicinity of the death camp. Their research also shows that higher proximity to the death camp had a long-term political impact, as communities near Treblinka exhibited higher electoral support for the anti-Semitic party, the League of Polish Families, in the 2001 election. This study shows how an innovative research design can utilize historical data to help us to understand questions with wide-ranging implications.

This richly sourced article draws on typically overlooked historical material, including correspondence and early drafts of *Perpetual Peace*, to advance a novel interpretation of Kant's cosmopolitanism. Although Kant has long been known for promoting ideals of international peace, in her article, "It's Not about Race: Good Wars, Bad Wars, and the Origins of Kant's Anti-Colonialism," Inés Valdez shows convincingly that such views must be examined alongside his claims about European international relations. From this juxtaposition emerges a new and important interpretive insight: Kant's theory of cosmopolitan right was not aimed at securing humane treatment to the distant others that Europeans sought to subjugate, but rather to securing peace within Europe. His condemnation of colonialism was thus directed at subduing the intrastate rivalry that extraterritorial possessions created among European powers, and could exist, Valdez argues, without tension alongside a hierarchical race theory.

In the letter, "A Pairwise Comparison Framework for Fast, Flexible, and Reliable Human Coding of Political Texts," David Carlson and Jacob M. Montgomery contribute to the growing field of research on crowdsourced coding for measuring and analyzing latent concepts in political texts. They do so by combining humans' natural ability to understand natural language with the capacity of computers to automate tasks. By automating the workflow for coding text units in a series of tasks suitable for nonexperts, their `SentimentIt` framework makes it convenient to measure researcher-defined characteristics via pairwise comparisons of texts using human crowd coders, which can be recombined using statistical scaling of the comparisons. They validate their platform with advertisements from U.S. Senate candidates and State Department reports on human rights.

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000417 Published online by Cambridge University Press

analysis illuminates or answers an important research question of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must make their work understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

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

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

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

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

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

[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

[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.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000417 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expected to make these data available if they themselves generated or collected them. However, if the protection of human subjects requires nondisclosure, if confidentiality agreements prohibit disclosure, if data are under legal constraint (i.e., they are classified, proprietary, or copyrighted), and/or if the logistical burden of sharing relevant data would be particularly high, the author will inform the editor at the time of submission. The editors can grant an exception with or without conditions, and may require an explanation of the restriction(s) prior to publication of the piece.

- *Production transparency*: Researchers providing access to evidence they themselves collected and/or generated are expected to offer a full account of the context in which the data were collected and/or generated and the procedures used to collect and/or generate them. They should also make available any research instruments they used (e.g., interview protocols, coding protocols, procedures for identifying appropriate informants). Researchers whose claims are based on analysis of a dataset they created themselves should clearly describe how they assembled the dataset.
- *Analytic transparency*: Researchers making evidence-based knowledge claims should clearly map the path from the evidence to the claims. In addition to information provided in the article's main text and footnotes, this path should be mapped in ways that correspond with the methodology employed. For example, researchers may wish to provide software code and associated supplemental material or a methodological appendix; or they can attach a transparency appendix (TRAX, see note [4] below). Generally, it is expected that researchers should make available materials sufficient to allow others to fully understand and, *where relevant and applicable*, reproduce their results.

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

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

[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.

[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/

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000417 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hyperlink to a trustworthy digital repository where the materials reside. Although not a requirement for submission, data access and production, and analytical transparency materials may make the manuscript more understandable and more compelling for reviewers.

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

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

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

Manuscript Formatting

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

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

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000417 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 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.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000417 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/S0003055417000417 Published online by Cambridge University Press