WORLD POLITICS
A Quarterly Journal of International Relations
LOUIS A. SIMPSON INTERNATIONAL BUILDING
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08544
TEL: (609) 258-8386 FAX: (609) 258-3988
E-MAIL: JSCHARFS@PRINCETON.EDU

Reviewer Guidelines

World Politics aims to publish outstanding scholarship in the fields of international relations and comparative politics. We are committed to showcasing two kinds of articles: 1) research articles that pose important substantive, political questions; significantly advance theoretical debates; and deploy original empirical research to advance knowledge on these issues; these are the three pillars of any research article, and we expect reviewers to evaluate the significance, theoretical advance, and empirical originality of all research articles that are under consideration; and 2) review articles that not only analyze and compare the contributions of a number of thematically related books, but also advance our understanding of how we should analyze and pursue future work on these themes.

Referees should offer constructive criticism, pointing out the strengths, delineating the problems and concerns, and providing specific suggestions to improve the piece. Professionalism is required in all reports, and we ask reviewers to remember that formal reviews are read both by the editorial committee and the author(s) of a given manuscript; the editorial committee reserves the right to edit comments in reviews that it deems unprofessional. In addition to their reports, reviewers may provide confidential comments to the editors in the so-named window in their Reviewer Center on the ScholarOne/*World Politics* Web site.

Procedures for reviewing manuscripts are triple blind. Author names are not revealed to reviewers. Author names are not revealed to editors until after *final* decisions are made on the manuscript. Reviewer names are not revealed to author. Given our triple-blind process, reviewers should inform us if they know the author and piece under review, *especially* if reviewers were graduate advisors and/or are coauthors; if there is this conflict of interest, reviewers should decline the review. Moreover, reviewers should inform us if they have reviewed the piece for another journal; in these circumstances reviewers should also decline.

To guide reviewers, we have outlined overall guidelines for all research articles, followed by two additional sections tailored to chart out expectations of scholarship deploying quantitative and/or qualitative research.

SUGGESTED REVIEWER GUIDELINES FOR ALL MANUSCRIPTS[1]

1. *Clarity of Statement of Major Research Goals*. To be publishable in *World Politics*, all papers must be driven by clearly stated, theoretically relevant research questions of discipline-wide interest, appeal, and substantive significance. We are interested in your

[1] What follows is adapted from the American Sociological Review's suggested reviewer guidelines for Ethnographic and Qualitative Research. At https://docs.google.com/document/d/1GYyw-S3K5TRYzPXsXJ2jPcgTO0G39nSo9e9fdwiOvuM/pub.

assessment as to whether the manuscript under review succeeds at this goal. If the manuscript fails to do so, we are interested in your recommendations as to whether and how the article can be revised so as to be successful in this respect.

2. *Engagement with Theoretical and Substantive Literature*. Articles must demonstrate serious engagement with the extant theoretical and empirical literature of relevance to their topic. Reviewers should comment on whether the author has framed the work in a theoretically and substantively interesting way; engaged with the relevant literature; and made a novel theoretical and empirical contribution to these debates.

3. *Clear Description of Research Design and Appropriateness of Methods*. The author should clearly delineate and justify the research design and methods used. These selection logics must be driven by a combination of methodological, theoretical, and substantive considerations indicating why they are relevant for addressing the research question and gaining analytical traction. We are interested in the reviewer's assessment of whether the manuscript successfully contains a clear and compelling statement of the research design, its scope conditions, and the methods deployed. Moreover, we are interested in whether the author conveys in a convincing manner the criteria used for data sets (if used), and/or case and site selection (where relevant).

4. *Analytic Clarity*. The author must be analytically clear about how analytic conclusions are made. We expect the author to be explicit about any procedures used to establish the existence of emergent themes and patterns in the data. As part of this process, reviewers should assess whether the author has successfully considered and disconfirmed alternative arguments.

5. *Validation and Conclusion*. Related to point 4, all papers should be attentive to issues of internal and external validity. This may involve triangulation across different methodological strategies, multiple sites, and reference to other scholarship. We are interested in the reviewer's evaluation of the extent to which the paper succeeds in providing the reader with sufficient indication that the findings are robust, reliable, and trustworthy.

6. *Appropriate Citations and Coverage of the Field.* The author should reference all relevant literature, with attention to citation biases that have historically disadvantaged women and minority scholars. Citation practices should also be thorough (i.e., including full bibliographic information, including page references for published work; digital object identifier (DOI) (preferred) or URL information for online publications; detailed archival information to locate relevant information; etc.). If limited by page constraints, detailed information can be included in an online appendix.

QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

In addition to the points raised above, reviewers of quantitative pieces should consider whether the manuscript has addressed the following issues.

1. *Quantitative Techniques.* Does the author choose the appropriate statistical, formal, or other techniques, and use them properly and in a transparent, accountable, and convincing way? Are the findings robust, reliable, and trustworthy? Where data sets are used, does the author evaluate how they fit into the research design and why they are appropriate as well as address the strengths/weaknesses of the data sets?

2. *Validity*. Has the author addressed concerns about internal and external validity?

3. *Data Access and Replicability*. Has the author indicated plans for making publicly available all data and code for all statistical analyses?

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

In addition to the points raised under "Suggested Reviewer Guidelines," reviewers of qualitative pieces should consider whether the manuscript has addressed the following issues.

1. *Sufficient Information Regarding Consent and Confidentiality Issues*. Qualitative work often involves close contact between researchers and the subjects of study. As such, this work must be particularly attentive to issues related to ethical and confidentiality standards. We are interested in the reviewer's assessment as to whether the article properly describes and follows standards designed to protect confidentiality and proper treatment of human subjects.

2. *Sufficiently Detailed Description of Setting, Participants, and/or Causal Processes*. Strong qualitative and ethnographic work often requires that the researcher provide the reader with a sufficiently detailed description of the setting studied, the participants involved, and/or the causal processes in question—although this information should only be provided if it does not compromise confidentiality nor raise ethical concerns. Accordingly, we are interested in the reviewer's evaluation of whether the author provides a sufficiently detailed and systematic account of relevant features of the site/setting under consideration, sociodemographic and other relevant background characteristics of participants (especially those relevant to credibility and selection into the study), and compelling evidence for the claims made. Editors will privilege authors' judgement about whether providing such information could compromise consent or confidentiality, as authors are best positioned to assess the potential risks.

3. *Sufficient Description of Interviewing Processes and Where Relevant, Sampling Procedures*. Often, qualitative work may feature interviews. We are interested in the reviewer's evaluation as to whether the procedure followed by the author is properly justified and adequately described (random versus nonrandom sampling; in the latter case including convenience, purposive, snowball, theoretical, or saturation). If the author has not done this, the reviewer should suggest the sort of information the author would ideally provide to make a more convincing case.