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Executive Summary

The current editorial team began their editorship on June 1, 2020. We have worked to maintain and improve the quality and integrity of the *American Political Science Review*, while broadening its readership, relevance, and contributor pool and expanding its commitment to research ethics. Our plan is to continue expanding these efforts.

- We have sought, for example, to expand our readership through our social media strategies, which include Tweeting and publishing blog posts with published authors. These efforts have paid off, as evident in the major jump in Journal Impact Factor (JIF) that we experienced since our team took over (from 4.183 in 2019 to 8.048 in 2021). We quadrupled our Altmetric social media scores within one year. These measures are only one way of evaluating success, but they nevertheless speak to the viability of our social media strategies.

- We have substantially increased our OpenAccess articles so that almost half of our pieces published in the most recent issue were available through OpenAccess.

- Our submissions have overall increased since our team started, however, the past year experienced a dip in submissions from 1,651 in 2020-21 to 1,467 in 2021-22, which we attribute to the consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic, but also to the increase that often occurs in the first year when a team begins its tenure.

- Our overall acceptance rate stands at 5.9%.

- The percentage of desk rejects stands at 42%, and the percentage of papers rejected after peer review stands at 45.2%.

- We have reduced the median days from submission to first invitation for peer review from 13 (prior team) to 10; from submission to reject after peer review from 84 (prior team) to 69; and from submission to invitation to revise after peer review from 129 (prior team) to 86. Our median days from submission to desk reject stands at 10, which is longer than the 6 days of the prior team, due to our policy of requiring at least two editors to sign off on a desk reject.

- Our team committed to using the entire page allocation of the journal. In the first volume entirely managed by our team, we published 1,520 pages or 102 manuscripts of research content, which is nearly double that of recent editorial teams.

- Looking at the proportion of accepted articles using specific approaches, we see that the biggest increases come in the proportion of articles that employ qualitative case studies, critical or poststructuralist approaches, and ethnography, which is consistent with our vision for the journal.

- In spite of the Covid-19 pandemic, we note an increase in solo female, female team, and mixed team submissions. We note a healthy increase in submissions for solo scholars of color, teams of scholars of color, and teams with at least one member identifying as a scholar of color.
1. **Background**

The *American Political Science Review*, the flagship journal of the discipline of political science, publishes cutting-edge research about important political issues, questions, and problems. The current editorial team began their editorship on June 1, 2020. We have worked to maintain and improve the quality and integrity of the *American Political Science Review*, while broadening its readership, relevance, and contributor pool and expanding its commitment to research ethics.

We are committed to responding to the concerns voiced by many colleagues who feel that the *APSR* has historically been unreceptive to them and to their work. This group includes political scientists who ask questions that our discipline often elides and scholars who adopt approaches, epistemologies, and methods that fall outside what traditionally has been considered mainstream. At the same time, we are committed to ensuring that the journal remains the premier outlet for the kinds of scholarship for which it has for decades maintained a deserved reputation of excellence.

With respect to the goal of expanding the *APSR*’s commitment to research ethics, we are, to our knowledge, the first editorial team in the discipline to adopt and implement the American Political Science Association’s *Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research*, which the APSA Council adopted in April 2020.

We took on the challenges of putting these ethical principles into practice, and of representing the diversity of subfields, geographic areas of study, methods, and approaches that the broad and pluralistic discipline of political science encompasses, as our team began its term amidst a global pandemic. This report provides updates on our progress. It details specific steps we have taken toward realizing our vision during the past year and highlights the most immediate remaining challenges. After introducing our team (section 2), we discuss the six principles that comprise our editorial vision and our progress toward realizing them (section 3). We then present relevant data to our goals, and also include data on submissions, turnaround times, and acceptance and rejection rates (section 4).

2. **The Team**

A. **Editors**

Our editorial team is unprecedented in many ways. We are an all-woman team with broad past editorial experience, methodological expertise, and a background in every subfield of the discipline. Our team is also diverse along lines of class background, race, ethnicity, and sexuality, and several of us bring research expertise in these areas to the table. Our expectation and belief is that the breadth of the team has helped attract submissions from a wider cross-section of scholarship. For more detail on the members of the Editorial Team, please see Appendix A.

B. **Managing editor and editorial assistants**

A full-time Managing Editor, Dragana Svraka, assists with the day-to-day operations of the journal. Svraka works closely with the Editors, particularly the Co-Lead Editors, and with the APSA office.

In addition, each of our team members works with one or more editorial assistants, who are either PhD students or post-docs based at their home institutions. Appendix A lists our editorial assistants.
C. Editorial board

Our editorial board of 111 distinguished scholars includes some who served on the editorial board for the prior team and many new members. This board represents significant substantive (e.g., field and subfield), methodological, and representational (e.g., different types of institutions and different gender and racial identities) diversity. Appendix A provides a full list of the editorial board members. Since our team started we have added nine new members to assist in areas we found ourselves in need of additional support (See Appendix A). Five members resigned, four of whom took on journal editing and other responsibilities that prevented them from being available.

D. Journal governance

On our team, every editor is an equal member. There is no single “lead” editor, and no one person defines the journal’s direction. We have worked hard, collaboratively, to forge a shared approach and agenda for our team. Each member of our team participates in at least one weekly meeting, at which we discuss manuscripts and other day-to-day issues related to the journal. Each member also serves on at least one standing committee (described in detail below), and we meet as a group for a retreat-style series of meetings each spring and fall.

Specifically, we have designated two Co-Lead Editors who oversee the smooth running of the journal and ensure that no manuscripts fall through the cracks. One of these Co-Leads changes every six months. Our overlapping terms ensure continuity, while bringing fresh energy and new eyes to the lead position every six months. To date, Clarissa Hayward, Julie Novkov, Kelly Kadera, and Denise Walsh have served as co-leads. Aili Tripp and Michelle Dion are the current co-lead editors. Sharon Austin, Julie Novkov, and Valeria Sinclair-Chapman will serve as future co-leads in the two years remaining. The two co-leads together with the last former lead form the Governance Committee, which provides leadership and coordination for the team.

In addition to the lead editor roles and the Governance Committee, we have four other special roles and three other committees. The special roles are: Data Specialist, Editor for Ethics of Human Participants Research, Social Media Editor, and three Appeals Editors. The committees are: Data and Transparency (which includes our Data Specialist), Ethics and Inclusion (which includes our Editor for Ethics of Human Participants Research), and Communications and Outreach (which includes our Social Media Editor). Every editor serves on at least one committee. For a roster of Committees and special roles, see Appendix A. Over the past year we have streamlined our operations and tasks and redistributed some of the roles of the lead editors, who had too much on their plate.

3. Our vision

Six principles define our editorial vision. After briefly describing each principle, we discuss our approach toward realizing each, and highlight our progress thus far, especially over the past year.

A. Editorial transparency

Our decision-making processes aim to meet the highest standards of transparency with respect to key aspects of the editorial process. To that end, we collect and make public data about our workflow, as well as about the composition of our reviewer pool, readership, and submitting and published authors.
When we took over the editorship, we produced new, detailed FAQs, describing key aspects of our editorial process. We have continued to update these FAQs, most recently outlining standards for decisions and information about our revised appeals process. These and other policies are explained on our APSA webpage. We have published a number of blog posts about our aims and values, as well as about our editorial practices and policies. Our Notes from the Editors have included detailed discussions on a variety of issues related to our policies, procedures, and outcomes:

- **Our ethics policies** February 2021
- **The effects of the COVID-19 pandemic** on submissions, reviewing, and turn-around time May 2021
- **Our collective decision-making style** August 2021
- **Our communication and outreach efforts** November 2021
- **Publishing in a general interest political science journal** February 2022
- **Increasing qualitative submissions** May 2022
- **Our review process**: From Submission to Publication August 2022
- **Our reviewers** (forthcoming)
- **Diversifying our citations** (forthcoming)

As we describe more in the section on outreach below, we have sought to increase transparency by participating in a wide variety of conferences and workshops and making editors available for questions in these multiple and varied venues. The pandemic made some of our outreach plans difficult to execute, but we continued as best we could via Zoom platforms and some in person events. We hope to engage in more in-person outreach as moving forward and welcome suggestions about how we might improve our availability as COVID waxes and wanes.

**B. Checks and balances**

Checks and balances in our editorial decision-making practices promote fairness and consistency, while ensuring that the journal publishes the highest-quality original work. From the outset, we have put several processes and policies in place to create checks and balances in decision-making. This past year we have taken further steps to streamline our work by developing clearer policies and procedures in key areas. Our hope is that future editorial teams will be able to use these guidelines.

- We have developed and publicized a straightforward appeal process available to all authors submitting to the journal. Between the start of our editorial term (June 1, 2020) and August 20, 2022, we considered and resolved 21 appeals.
- We developed a process for thematically organizing the Table of Contents, which is new to the journal.
- We have also streamlined a number of internal processes as team members have defined their specific editorial interests and expertise. For example, we have one dedicated editor who now leads the cover consultation process.

**C. Commitment to research ethics**

In implementing the third principle of our vision statement, we have focused on research that directly engages human participants and have adopted APSA's Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research (approved by the Council in April 2020).
The following themes from the APSA Principles particularly inform our work:

- In scholarly presentations and publications, researchers should disclose from whom and why they sought consent (principle 5); disclose and explain any use of deception (principle 6); and respect assurances of confidentiality or anonymity (and, in the absences of assurances, nonetheless assess possible risks and harms should participants be identified) (principle 9).
- If authors judge that sharing research materials would be unethical (or for other well-founded reasons), they should provide a reasoned justification for this decision (principle 9).
- Scholars should report likely impacts on participants and on broader political processes (principle 10); acknowledge whether they complied with relevant laws and regulations (principle 11); and explain and justify any deviations from the Principles (principle 3).
- Editors and reviewers should encourage researchers to be open about the ethical decisions they made in conducting their research; encourage research on research ethics; and provide editorial expressions of concern or solicit independent commentaries when publishing ethically troubling research (principle 12).
- In scholarly publications and presentations, research should include a brief reasoned justification for any deviation(s) from the APSA Principles and (if needed) an extended justification in an appendix. Such justifications should be included on submission.

To assist us in realizing this goal, seven members of our Editorial Board serve as our Advisory Board for Ethical Research (ABER) (See Appendix). One of our team members, Elisabeth Wood, leads our efforts in this area and serves as our liaison to the ABER.

Our submission guidelines, FAQs, and submission interface all emphasize that authors submitting manuscripts based on research involving human participants must either affirm adherence to the principles, or if they claim an exception, provide a reasoned justification. We flag manuscripts that do not provide sufficient discussion of research ethics and send them back before considering them for review. In other words, we conduct an ethical check at the time of submission, just as we do a check for technical matters like length and blinding.

Between June 1, 2020, and August 29, 2022, we sent back approximately 467 manuscripts (about 13% of the submissions received during our tenure) for clarification about ethical aspects of research procedures. In almost every case, the authors provided the needed clarifications quickly, and we then assigned their manuscripts to a team member (to decide whether to desk reject on substantive grounds or to send for review). Typical reasons for sending manuscripts back for ethical clarification include that the authors indicated their research did not involve human participants, when it did, or failed to address questions about consent or deception.

We have also revised the journal’s reviewer instructions so that they now prompt reviewers to evaluate a manuscript’s research ethics. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this policy is having an impact.

D. Substantive, methodological, and representational diversity

We are committed to increasing the range of research topics published in the APSR while maintaining the journal’s profile in its traditional areas of excellence. By using the journal’s entire page allocation and by procuring 32 additional pages per issue from Cambridge, we have been able to broaden the
range of questions and topics addressed in the journal without sacrificing attention to work that the APSR has traditionally published. We have increased the number of articles published from 87 in 2018 to 117 in 2021 with 36% more pages used. We have a 1,536 page budget and we will use all of it this year. Last year we used all but five pages of this allocation.

To help us understand why underrepresentation of some questions and topics persists in issues of the APSR, we have been analyzing data about submission topics and author demographics. While this is a complex question, one conclusion has been that we need to diversify submissions to the journal. This means communicating to underrepresented constituencies that our journal is open to their work and trying to change the perception of the journal as one that is narrowly focused on a few methods, regions of the world, and dominant groups of political actors.

One of the earliest steps we took to encourage a wider range of submissions was to build a large, representative Editorial Board. Our board intentionally reflects the diverse fields, subfields, methods, approaches, regional specializations, and identities that comprise APSA and the discipline. We have asked board members to encourage colleagues to submit their work.

Our editorial team also undertook additional measures to encourage submissions, including outreach to specific professional conference research sections and groups, including attending their meetings and making tailored presentations to encourage their members to submit (more on this in Section E).

E. Active engagement with the APSA membership

When we first articulated the principles that define our editorial vision, we noted that active engagement with the APSA membership would help us accomplish several goals: promoting the journal, connecting with scholars, understanding their priorities and concerns, and increasing substantive, methodological, and representational diversity.

To this end, we have attended a wide variety of research section and caucus meetings at the national APSA meetings as well as other regional and subfield meetings throughout the past year in spite of the pandemic. We reached out to constituencies that have been especially poorly represented in the APSR. Aili Tripp, Elisabeth Wood, and Michelle Dion spoke at different events hosted by Project on Middle East Political Science (POMEPS). Julie Novkov organized and led a Webinar on Strategies for Teaching Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization. The team has spoken on publishing with a general interest journal at several events: Aili Tripp at the European University Institute, Florence, Italy, and the University of Uppsala, in Sweden; Julie Novkov at UMass Amherst Directions in Law and Society Conference and at the New School for Social Research; Dara Strolovitch at the Minority Politics Online Seminar Series (MPOSS) and at the Criminal Justice and Injustice Conference at Yale University; Kelly Kadera to Women in Conflict Studies (WICS) and Sharon Austin at the American University of Paris.

Also, at the 2022 APSA meeting, Laurel Weldon and Valeria Sinclair-Chapman held a roundtable on diversifying political science journals; Celeste Montoya chaired a panel with four other Editorial Team members on “Communication Strategies for Publishing and Promoting Your Scholarship in the APSR”; and Valeria Sinclair-Chapman and Kelly Kadera participated in a roundtable of the APSA Presidential Task Force on “Systemic Inequality in the Discipline: Implications for Journals and Publishing Practices.”

We welcome suggestions about additional steps we might take to engage actively with the membership.
F. Modernizing the journal’s communications and promoting articles more widely

We have continued our efforts to raise the public profile of the journal and to improve the visibility of, and readers’ access to, the work we publish through our social media presence on Twitter and Facebook. We post regularly, particularly to draw attention to the excellent work we are publishing. Follow us and retweet/repost!

Tables 1 and 2 present Twitter and Facebook analytics (from Hootsuite), which we use to manage the Journal’s social media accounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: TWITTER ANALYTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Followers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*January 1-August 24, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: FACEBOOK ANALYTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Followers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*January 1-August 24, 2022

We have two blogs. The team produces an Editors’ Blog post as needs arise (e.g., informing prospective authors about a policy update) or to communicate information that we think will be helpful to prospective authors. We also facilitate an Author’s Blog, which features our authors’ research, and link to ungated early access to their articles. We have found the Conversations with the Authors to be a particularly rewarding format for the authors’ blog posts. Table 3 shows our team’s blog posts (shaded entries are Editors’ posts) thus far and the number of page views each has received. Graduate student fellows in the APSA Public Scholarship Program complement our work with blogs summarizing select APSR articles.
We have published five virtual special collections. Two of them have been guest-curated by board members. In 2021, board member Peace Medie guest-curated and edited one celebrating International Women’s Day. In 2022, board member Farah Godrej curated a Juneteenth Collections: Examining the Structure and Consequences of the Carceral State. For two others, we collaborated with the editors of PS: Political Science and Politics and Perspectives on Politics. One examined Protests, Policing, and Race and the other focused on the Crisis of American Democracy. We are interested in developing additional virtual special issues and welcome both offers to help and input on ideas. We are also exploring other media content, such as short podcasts and video clips of authors discussing their research. Most recently, we collaborated for a special collection on Abortion Politics. We are currently working on a new guest-curated special edition on voting rights, in preparation for the 2022 elections.
Authors have also increasingly opted to facilitate open access to their research. We look forward to working with APSA and CUP to support the upward trend in open access (see Table 4), which we anticipate will further strengthen the journal’s profile and help our authors to reach wider audiences, including those beyond the academy. Almost half of the pieces published in our most recent issue (115.3) were available via Open Access.

Reviewing the Altmetric performance of articles provides some evidence that these efforts are bearing fruit. Altmetric tracks the online attention that articles garner, producing a detailed report of where and how online users are encountering and interacting with published articles. Altmetric collects this data and uses it to produce a score that approximates the level and range of engagement with each article. We almost quadrupled the number of mentions recorded by Altmetric for all articles in the journal since 2021 (a jump from 15,321 last year to 58,518 this year).

Below is a list of the top 5 APSR research articles (Table 5). Each has an Altmetric Attention Score, which provides an indicator of the amount of attention that has been received.
### Table 5: Altmetric Scores for Top Five APSR Research Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Attention Score</th>
<th>Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>How Empathic Concern Fuels Political Polarization. Article in <em>American Political Science Review</em>, October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>Activating Animus: The Uniquely Social Roots of Trump Support. Article in <em>American Political Science Review</em>, June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Can Exposure to Celebrities Reduce Prejudice? The Effect of Mohamed Salah on Islamophobic Behaviors and Attitudes. Article in <em>American Political Science Review</em>, June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>The Psychology of Online Political Hostility: A Comprehensive, Cross-National Test of the Mismatch Hypothesis. Article in <em>American Political Science Review</em>, August 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cambridge University Press Altmetric Report

Our Communications Committee has led these developments to improve our visibility on social media. We are grateful for Celeste Montoya’s excellent work as our social media editor, a position the APSR has never previously had.

4. **Data-Based Assessments: Submissions, Editorial Decisions, and Impact**
   
   **A. Manuscript submissions overview**

   APSR’s submissions had been trending upward until 2020-21 and then they declined somewhat in 2021-22 (Figure 1). Manuscript submissions increased significantly in our team’s first year by 470 manuscripts. They then dropped by 184 submissions the following year. We attribute this to Covid and the toll it took on our contributors. Some of the initial increase may have also be due to an initial interest in the new Editorial Team, as is sometimes the case when a new team begins its tenure. Even with the drop in submissions, we still have experienced an overall increase in submissions when compared with prior teams. However, this is something we are monitoring. Further, we have noticed a slight rebound in weekly submissions this summer, which we hope will continue. The proportion of manuscripts submitted as letters, a format introduced in 2016, has substantially increased from 168 in 2018-19 to 320 in 2020-21, and we expect that to continue when data from the last months of 2022 becomes available.

---

1 The tables and figures below are usually based on all submissions between 2008-07-01 and 2022-07-31. Academic years ran July 1-June 30 for all teams except the final year of the Mannheim team, which ended May 31, 2020. From June 1, 2020, onward, the academic year will run June 1 through May 31. The prior year below is between 2021-06-01 and 2022-05-31. The current year is between 2022-06-01 & 2023-05-31. Note, the end date for the current year is July 31, 2022.
B. Workflow and decision outcomes

Despite these increases, our turnaround times are comparable to or better than those of prior teams (Table 6). Our median days from submission to first invitation to review (for manuscripts that we send out for review) is 10 days, which is quicker than the median for recent teams, while our median turnaround time for desk rejects is also 10 days, which is four days longer than the previous team. Our policy of requiring at least two editors to weigh in on desk rejects, which has the advantage of ensuring that each manuscript is given careful consideration, has not excessively increased our desk reject turnaround time. For manuscripts with completed decisions after peer review, the median number of days between submission and the decision is about 69 days for rejections and 86 days for an initial invitation to revise and resubmit.

C. Turnaround times

Below, we report standardized turnaround times for new submissions by editorial team. We omit turnaround times that are sensitive to how different teams organize their internal workflows and focus instead on when a manuscript changes its editorial status (e.g., submission complete, under review, decision made). We adjust the submission date to be the date when all (co)authors have verified their role on the submission.

### TABLE 6. SUBMISSIONS, DECISIONS, AND TURNAROUND TIMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>UNT</th>
<th>Mannheim</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of new submissions</td>
<td>2753</td>
<td>3663</td>
<td>4719</td>
<td>3345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new submissions sent out for peer review</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>2787</td>
<td>2809</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new submissions desk rejected</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>UNT</td>
<td>Mannheim</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new submissions rejected after peer review</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of invitations to revise after peer review</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of decisions</td>
<td>2733</td>
<td>3661</td>
<td>4716</td>
<td>3145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of new submissions sent out for review</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of new submissions rejected without peer review</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of decisions that are desk reject</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of decisions that are reject after peer review</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of decisions that are revise and resubmit</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median days from submission to first invitation for peer review</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median days from submission to desk reject</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median days from submission to reject after peer review</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median days from submission to invitation to revise after peer review</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures below plot the distribution of turnaround days for new manuscripts.

**FIGURE 2. DAYS FROM INITIAL SUBMISSION TO UNDER REVIEW**
**Figure 3. Days from initial submission to desk reject**

UCLA:
- n = 517
- median = 14

UNT:
- n = 874
- median = 4

Mannheim:
- n = 1910
- median = 6

Current:
- n = 1320
- median = 10

**Figure 4. Days from initial submission to reject after peer review**

UCLA:
- n = 2037
- median = 81

UNT:
- n = 2536
- median = 62

Mannheim:
- n = 2442
- median = 84

Current:
- n = 1420
- median = 69
The turnaround time between a new manuscript’s initial submission and the first invitation to review (Figure 2) or a desk reject decision (Figure 3) are easy to compare. Our turnaround times are similar to those of the three previous editorial teams.

Figure 4 shows days from first submission to reject after peer review for our team and the three that preceded us. Figure 5 shows days from first submission to revise after peer review. Both Figures 4 and 5 include only manuscripts with completed decisions.

Our editorial team’s overall rate of desk rejection also parallels the prior team’s rate (Table 6). We have so far desk rejected 39.5% of submissions, a rate slightly lower than that of the prior team’s rate (40.5% of manuscripts), but higher than the UNT and the UCLA team’s desk reject rates. Like the Mannheim team, we have invited peer reviewers to provide feedback on about 59% of new submissions.

Of course, turnaround times reflect not only the time needed to identify and invite reviewers, but also the likelihood that invited reviewers will agree to review and complete their reviews before a decision is made. Table 7 summarizes the mean number of reviewers invited to review each manuscript, the mean number of completed reviews, and the percent of invited reviewers who complete reviews, by editorial team. Our team is inviting, on average, one more reviewer per manuscript (6.2 vs. 5.1) than the previous team, which is consistent with our lower completion rate (47.4% vs. 56.9%).
Table 7: Reviewers, All New Manuscripts with Initial Decisions, 2008-2022*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>UNT</th>
<th>Mannheim</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean reviewers invited per manuscript</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean reviews completed per manuscript</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total invited that are completed</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*July 1, 2008 – July 31, 2022

Anecdotally, we note that many reviewers mention the impact of the pandemic on their ability to accept a review invitation and in their responses to our queries regarding late reviews. Our forthcoming Notes from the Editors in November’s issue provides additional information on these patterns, including the likely impact of Covid on reviewer behavior. Figure 6, which will appear in the Notes from the Editors, illustrates the inverse relationship between the number of invited reviewers and the time to an initial decision after review. When editors initially invite more reviewers per manuscript or add new reviewers when original reviewers have not completed their reviews in a timely fashion, average times to decision tend to be shorter.

Table 8 presents summary information about the reviewers who were invited and completed reviews for manuscripts submitted to the APSR and for which the review process is complete (i.e., a decision has been made).

Table 8. Reviewer Characteristics for New Submissions with Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>UNT</th>
<th>Mannheim</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of manuscripts</td>
<td>2250.0</td>
<td>2792.0</td>
<td>2813.0</td>
<td>1822.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>11597.0</td>
<td>17585.0</td>
<td>14338.0</td>
<td>11277.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>7455.0</td>
<td>10506.0</td>
<td>9325.0</td>
<td>6334.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined</td>
<td>3168.0</td>
<td>4331.0</td>
<td>3318.0</td>
<td>3432.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>6013.0</td>
<td>8444.0</td>
<td>8155.0</td>
<td>5340.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited, female</td>
<td>2358.0</td>
<td>5232.0</td>
<td>4324.0</td>
<td>4181.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited, male</td>
<td>9141.0</td>
<td>12164.0</td>
<td>9847.0</td>
<td>6865.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed, female</td>
<td>1226.0</td>
<td>2408.0</td>
<td>2282.0</td>
<td>1835.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed, male</td>
<td>4732.0</td>
<td>5945.0</td>
<td>5793.0</td>
<td>3414.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited, Europe</td>
<td>1609.0</td>
<td>3148.0</td>
<td>3538.0</td>
<td>2437.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited, North America</td>
<td>9587.0</td>
<td>13592.0</td>
<td>10044.0</td>
<td>8137.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited, other regions</td>
<td>401.0</td>
<td>845.0</td>
<td>756.0</td>
<td>698.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed, Europe</td>
<td>890.0</td>
<td>1480.0</td>
<td>2076.0</td>
<td>1095.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed, North America</td>
<td>4891.0</td>
<td>6523.0</td>
<td>5618.0</td>
<td>3887.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed, other regions</td>
<td>232.0</td>
<td>441.0</td>
<td>461.0</td>
<td>358.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited per manuscript</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed per manuscript</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% invited, female</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% invited, Europe</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also report (in Figure 8) the percentage of reviewers who have first names highly likely to be associated with female reviewers, which has markedly increased under our tenure, despite widespread reports that female scholars (and other marginalized groups) have suffered lower professional productivity during the pandemic.
This past year we selected 20 Star Reviewers for recognition at the 2022 Annual Meeting. These are individuals who went beyond the call of duty within the past two years in their capacity as reviewers for the APSR. Some provided outstanding reviews that substantially improved the quality of submissions; others provided especially constructive and positive feedback, offered quality guidance to authors, supplied us with speedy or numerous reviews, helped adjudicate difficult cases, did emergency reviews for us, or provided other exceptional service as a reviewer of the journal (See Appendix A).

D. Summary of submissions and acceptance decisions

This section presents summary statistics for new submissions to the current team and with an initial decision during their term to the end date of this report (2022-07-31). The mean number of revisions for manuscripts with final accept status is 2.95. Our desk reject rate is 42%. After review our acceptance rate is 55%, and after revision it is 87%. Thus, we have an acceptance rate of 74% if a new submission received an initial invitation to revise and resubmit by our team (even if originally submitted prior to our tenure) and has a final decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Decisions on initial/new submissions by current team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some instances, reviewers and assigned editors believe a new manuscript has promise but also may raise theoretical substantive or methodological questions we invite authors to address in their revisions. Though we try to minimize rejecting articles after revision, in some instances the revisions may reveal theoretical, substantive, or methodological problems that were not evident in the original submission and make further consideration for publication untenable. To reduce the likelihood of these issues, we have implemented additional technical checks upon submission to ensure that reviewers have sufficient information, particularly detailed tables to support figures illustrating core findings, to make informed recommendations.

Our team’s overall final acceptance rate for all submissions that both were initially submitted to and have a final decision by our team is 5.9%. We note that calculating annual acceptance rates can be fraught because in any given year, some accepted manuscripts were initially submitted several years earlier, and many new submissions may not have a final decision until a subsequent year.

E. Overall number of pages and manuscripts

Our team committed to using the entire page allocation of the journal. Below is a tally of the number of articles and letters published every year since 2008. In 2021, the first volume entirely managed by our
team, we published 1,520 pages or 102 manuscripts of research content, which is nearly double that of recent editorial teams. Considered together, the relative increase in both submissions (Figure 1) and published content (Figure 7) suggest that we are making gains toward our team’s stated goals of increasing submissions and acceptances, while only modestly increasing the overall acceptance rate. This is also consistent with our commitment to continue publishing the same types of research typically associated with the *APSR* while expanding the journal’s remit to embrace greater substantive and methodological diversity.

**Figure 7. NUMBER OF PAGES AND MANUSCRIPTS IN EACH VOLUME OF APSR**

![Graph showing number of pages and manuscripts in each volume of APSR](image)

Source: Web of Science

**F. Submissions and acceptances by subfield and method**

The online submission interface asks corresponding authors to answer two questions about their manuscript’s primary subfield. One is a required field called “section” and the other has different categories approved by APSA Council and was added to the submission questionnaire in January 2018. Here, we focus on the former question because it provides longer uninterrupted response continuity. We note that the limited response options to both questions can lead to some poor or misleading classification of manuscripts, particularly those at the intersection of two or more categories. Answers to both questions indicate that the largest proportion of submissions and accepted articles under past teams has been in the comparative subfield, with the second largest subfield being American (Table 10). That pattern continues with our team.
Regarding accepted articles (Table 11), we note that many of our team’s final acceptances in the first year were manuscripts initially submitted and sent out for review under the prior team. Nevertheless, a few changes are worth noting. The proportion of accepted articles that focus on Race, Ethnicity and Politics, 5.9%, is the largest reported by the four most recent teams. The proportion of accepted manuscripts in International Relations have returned to levels comparable to that of the pre-Mannheim team. While the number of acceptances in formal theory and methodology in our first two years are comparable (or suggest growth in the number of acceptances) to the overall numbers for the most recent team, as a proportion of overall acceptances, the rate is lower.
G. Primary methodology according to corresponding author

Since January 2018, corresponding authors have also been asked to report the primary methodology used in the submission, based on question wording and categories approved by APSA Council.

Tables 12 and 15 report submissions and accepted manuscripts according to this classification. Shifts in patterns of submissions are modest so far, with a slight increase in manuscripts using experimental methods, and a slight decrease in those using formal models and statistical-observational approaches (Table 12). As part of our submission process, we also ask corresponding authors to indicate what type(s) of evidence they use in their submissions. Table 13 provides an overview of the distribution of the types of evidence used in manuscripts submitted during our tenure through July 31, 2022.

### Table 12: New Submissions by Method and Editorial Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Type</th>
<th>Mannheim</th>
<th>Current*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study/Small N</td>
<td>151 (5.0%)</td>
<td>175 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Theory/Poststructuralist</td>
<td>45 (1.5%)</td>
<td>67 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td>15 (0.5%)</td>
<td>18 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (lab, survey, or field)</td>
<td>476 (15.8%)</td>
<td>606 (18.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>261 (8.7%)</td>
<td>185 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>234 (7.8%)</td>
<td>246 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>240 (8.0%)</td>
<td>284 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical-Observational</td>
<td>1595 (52.9%)</td>
<td>1633 (50.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3017 (100.0%)</td>
<td>3214 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These categorizations are chosen by the corresponding author using submission questionnaire approved by APSA Council, January 2018. NAs are omitted. Only includes 2.5 years of Mannheim team tenure.

*As of July 31, 2022

### Table 13. Submitted Manuscripts by Evidence Type (Current team only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No empirical</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed evidence</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3347</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the proportion of accepted articles using specific approaches (Table 17), we see that the biggest increases come in the proportion of articles that employ qualitative case studies, critical or poststructuralist approaches, and ethnography, which is consistent with our vision for the journal. While there were some modest decreases in the relative proportions of accepted articles using formal
modeling and statistical analyses, the raw numbers of accepted manuscripts in these categories remain large.

**TABLE 14: ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPTS BY METHODOLOGY AND EDITORIAL TEAM MAKING FINAL DECISION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Mannheim</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study/Small N</td>
<td>2 (1.0%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Theory/Poststructuralist</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (lab, survey, or field)</td>
<td>36 (18.3%)</td>
<td>50 (19.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>24 (12.2%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>12 (6.1%)</td>
<td>23 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>10 (5.1%)</td>
<td>16 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical-Observational</td>
<td>113 (57.4%)</td>
<td>139 (53.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>197 (100.0%)</td>
<td>260 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These categorizations are chosen by the corresponding author using submission questionnaire approved by APSA Council, January 2018. Only includes 2.5 years of Mannheim team tenure. NAs are omitted.

*As of July 31, 2022

5. **Demographics: authors and reviewers**

   A. **Gender and race/ethnicity**

Since 2018, all authors of a manuscript submitted to the *APSR* are asked to report their gender and racial/ethnic identities, allowing us to examine submission patterns by gender and race/ethnicity. Figure 8 shows the distribution of authors who report binary gender identities. In multiauthor teams, if at least one author identified as female and one identifies as male, the team is coded as mixed gender, regardless of whether other authors answered the gender identity question. Comparing our team with the Mannheim team, we note an increase in solo female, female team, and mixed team submissions, which may be surprising, given reports from other journal editors of a decrease in submissions by women over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic.
*As of July 31, 2022  
Note: Excludes submissions before January 1, 2018, when submission questionnaire was implemented.

Figure 9 shows the distribution of authors’ self-identified race or ethnicity. Specifically, it shows whether authors identify as white or Black, Indigenous, or another racial identity and, in the case of teams, whether at least one, but not necessarily all, authors identify as Black, Indigenous, or other person of color. Comparing our team with the Mannheim team, we note a healthy increase in submissions for solo scholars of color, teams of scholars of color, and teams with at least one member identifying as a scholar of color.

*As of Sep. 30, 2021  
Note: Excludes submissions before January 1, 2018, when submission questionnaire was implemented.
B. Location of corresponding author

The geographic distribution of submissions (according to the location of the corresponding author) has not changed much during our tenure (Tables 18 and 19), despite outreach efforts. We welcome suggestions from the Editorial Board about how we might encourage more high-quality submissions from regions beyond the United States, Canada, and Europe.

**TABLE 18. ARTICLE AND LETTER SUBMISSIONS BY WORLD BANK REGION OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of author</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>UNT</th>
<th>Mannheim</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. America</td>
<td>2022 (72.9%)</td>
<td>2480 (67.6%)</td>
<td>2901 (61.4%)</td>
<td>2025 (60.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>269 (9.7%)</td>
<td>449 (12.2%)</td>
<td>568 (12.0%)</td>
<td>460 (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>484 (17.4%)</td>
<td>739 (20.1%)</td>
<td>1258 (26.6%)</td>
<td>868 (25.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2775 (100.0%)</td>
<td>3668 (100.0%)</td>
<td>4727 (100.0%)</td>
<td>3353 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Europe includes Western, Northern, and Southern Europe, but excludes Eastern Europe. N. America includes the USA and Canada only.

**TABLE 19. ARTICLE & LETTER SUBMISSIONS BY UNITED NATIONS LOCATION OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>UNT</th>
<th>Mannheim</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>2037 (73.4%)</td>
<td>2518 (68.6%)</td>
<td>2934 (62.1%)</td>
<td>2065 (61.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>49 (1.8%)</td>
<td>80 (2.2%)</td>
<td>81 (1.7%)</td>
<td>66 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>185 (6.7%)</td>
<td>291 (7.9%)</td>
<td>406 (8.6%)</td>
<td>302 (9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>495 (17.8%)</td>
<td>768 (20.9%)</td>
<td>1298 (27.5%)</td>
<td>902 (26.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>9 (0.3%)</td>
<td>11 (0.3%)</td>
<td>8 (0.2%)</td>
<td>18 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2775 (100.0%)</td>
<td>3668 (100.0%)</td>
<td>4727 (100.0%)</td>
<td>3353 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Regions are those defined by UN: [https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/)

C. Reviewer demographics

The APSR does not collect detailed demographic information about reviewers at the time of their review, and reviewer profiles do not retain historical information or may be out of date. This limits our ability to say much about the characteristics of our reviewers. However, Table 20 presents summary information about invited reviewers for initial submissions that have gone through the entire review process (i.e., a desk reject, reject after review, or invite to R&R decision has been made). Using genderizeR to code names that can be associated with a particular gender suggests that a larger proportion of our invited reviewers (38%, just shy of the APSA’s proportion of members identifying as women) for new manuscripts are women than for past teams. We also have a slightly smaller proportion of reviewers from Europe than the Mannheim team, although a higher proportion from Europe than the two previous teams, and a slightly larger proportion of reviewers from regions outside North America and Europe/Central Asia than previous teams.
Table 20: Reviewer invitations for manuscripts with decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>UNT</th>
<th>Mannheim</th>
<th>Current*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of manuscripts</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women as % of invited reviewers</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European as % invited reviewers</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA/Canada as % of invited reviewers</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other regions as % of invited reviewers</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Gender & region coding may not be complete for all reviewers and are based on profile information, which may not be complete or up to date.

*As of July 31, 2022

6. Citations

Measures of a journal’s quality typically rely on citations to its published articles. Some compare those citations against those for similar journals (e.g., those in the same discipline or field of study). While such measures give imperfect representations of the value of the work a journal publishes (e.g., they do not account for systemic biases in citation patterns, do not assess whether publications get cited for desirable or undesirable reasons, and are sensitive to shifts in algorithms for calculating the scores), they can give us a sense of the overall trends and patterns in a journal’s status. We briefly consider two measures: the Journal Impact Factor (JIF) and the Journal Citation Index (JCI).

A journal’s impact factor (JIF) is the average number of citations in a given year to an article published in the last two years. It is calculated by dividing the number of citations to all articles in the two-year window by the total number of articles published in that period. The 2021 impact factor for APSR is 8.048, an increase from 7.828 since the current team took over in 2020. This means that on average, an article appearing in the journal in 2019 or 2020 was cited about 8 times in 2021. In 2021, Web of Science began including articles published online prior to their print publication (e.g., FirstView at CUP) in the JIF calculations. This score punctuates an upward climb since 2016, and the APSR’s IF is now higher several peers that publish research for a general political science audience (see Figure 10). This places the APSR among the top four research outlets in political science ranked by Web of Science.

The Journal Citation Index (JCI) is a relatively new measure of the Web of Science, designed to anchor a journal’s score to comparisons with other journals in the same field. It also normalizes by type of publication and year of publication and uses a window for both the citable papers and the citing papers. Users interpret a journal’s score against a normalized score of 1, which would mean that a journal’s published pieces received citations equal to the average citations for papers of that type in that year in journals in that field. The APSR’s 2021 JCI is 3.49, meaning that a paper published in the journal in the 2018-2020 period received 3.49 more citations from publications in this period than did parallel papers. Because most papers receive zero citations, most journals’ scores are below 1. We are thus happy to report a score well above 1. We can also report that the APSR’s JCI has been rising since 2017, when it was at 2.65, although in 2020 it was slightly higher at 3.57. It should be noted that the JCI measure largely captures manuscripts published or processed before our team took over in June 2020.
Much, if not most, of the credit for the APSR’s current impact metrics goes to previous teams’ steadfast stewardships. We also attribute some to the current team’s social media presence, which helps drive traffic to the journal’s present and past publications (see discussion above).

7. Conclusion

Based on our first two and a half years of stewarding the APSR, we can say that we have met or exceeded most of our goals. We have developed and implemented policies that aim to promote the principles we articulated in our initial proposal to serve as editors: editorial transparency; editorial checks and balances; a commitment to research ethics; substantive, methodological, and representational diversity; active engagement with the APSA membership; and modernizing the journal’s communications. We have increased the visibility of the journal through our social media outreach. All of these strategies resulted in significant journal impact factor and Altmetric increases. We have also managed to maintain reasonable turnaround times for authors despite the challenges posed by the global pandemic. We continue to monitor our submissions and will be redoubling our efforts to ensure that political scientists submit their best work to the APSR. As a cohesive, collaborative, and effective team, we are excited about what we have accomplished, even as we recognize that we still have far to go.

Drawing on this report as a baseline for future progress we welcome input on how best to further advance our goals. We are particularly interested in any suggestions about how to improve our efforts to reach out to the APSR’s many diverse constituencies.
APPENDIX A: People

Editorial Team

- **Sharon Wright Austin**, Professor of Political Science, University of Florida
- **Michelle L. Dion**, Professor of Political Science & Sen. Wm. McMaster Chair in Gender & Methodology, McMaster University
- **Clarissa Rile Hayward**, Professor of Political Science, Washington University in St. Louis
- **Kelly M. Kadera**, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Iowa
- **Celeste Montoya**, Associate Professor of Political Science and Women & Gender Studies, University of Colorado, Boulder
- **Julie Novkov**, Professor of Political Science and Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, University at Albany, SUNY
- **Valeria Sinclair-Chapman**, Associate Professor of Political Science, Purdue University
- **Dara Strolovitch**, Professor of Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, American Studies, and Political Science, Yale University
- **Aili Mari Tripp**, Vilas Research Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin, Madison
- **Denise M. Walsh**, Associate Professor of Politics and Women, Gender, and Sexuality, University of Virginia
- **S. Laurel Weldon**, Distinguished Professor of Political Science, Simon Fraser University
- **Elisabeth Jean Wood**, Crosby Professor of the Human Environment and Professor of Political Science, Yale University

Editorial Team Committee Memberships and Special Roles, August 2022
(Note: Committee and role assignments are updated every six months.)

**Governance:** Comprised of two Co-Lead Editors and the editor who most recently rotated off that position, this committee handles matters of internal organization and process.
- Michelle Dion (Co-Lead Editor)
- Aili Tripp (Co-Lead Editor)
- Denise Walsh

**Equity, Inclusion, and Ethics:** Comprised of the Editor for Ethics of Human Participants Research and two additional editors, this committee handles matters related to research ethics, as well as equity, diversity, and inclusion.
- S. Laurel Weldon
- Elisabeth Jean Wood (Editor for Ethics of Human Participants Research)
- Valeria Sinclair-Chapman
- Dara Strolovitch

**Data and Transparency:** Comprised of the Data Specialist and two additional editors, this committee handles matters of gathering and reporting data about ourselves and the journal’s authors and reviewers.
- Kelly Kadera (Committee Chair)
- Michelle L. Dion (Data Specialist)
• Clarissa Hayward
• Dara Strolovitch

**Communications and Outreach:** Comprised of the Social Media Editors and two additional editors, this committee handles matters of communication with the discipline and its various sub-groups and the larger public, as well as internal communication.

• Celeste Montoya (Social Media Editor)
• Julie Novkov
• Sharon Wright Austin

**Appeals Editors:**

• Clarissa Hayward
• Elisabeth Wood
• S. Laurel Weldon

**Managing Editor**

Dragana Svraka

**Editorial Assistants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Austin</td>
<td>Kristen Gary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeria S Chapman</td>
<td>Scovia Aweko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Dion</td>
<td>Joshua Fawcett-Weiner (UBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gustavo Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarissa Hayward</td>
<td>Jenna Pedersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dahjin Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Kadera</td>
<td>Chase LaSpisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste Montoya</td>
<td>Kathryn Schauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel O’Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Novkov</td>
<td>Connor Moran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dara Strolovitch</td>
<td>Nicholas Ottone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aili Tripp</td>
<td>Monica Komer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Walsh</td>
<td>Carolyn Anh Dang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Weldon</td>
<td>Jessica Burch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sahar Zaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Wood</td>
<td>Melissa Pavlik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Editorial Board
*New members as of 2022

Adida, Claire
Ayoub, Phillip
Balfour, Lawrie
Baldez, Lisa
Beckwith, Karen
Boone, Catherine
Box-Steffensmeier, Janet
Brandwein, Pamela
Broockman, David
Brown, Nadia E.
Buhr, Renee
Chhibber, Pradeep
*Clifford, Scott
Cohen, Cathy
Cramer, Katherine
*Croco, Sarah Elizabeth
Currah, Paisley
Davenport, Christian
Debs, Alexandre
DeMeritt, Jacqueline H.R.
Desposato, Scott
Deylami, Shirin
*Dietrich, Simone
Druckman, James N.
Dunning, Thad
Ellis, Elisabeth
Fazal, Tanisha
Finkel, Evgeny
Frank, Jason
Frank, Jill
Franzese, Robert J.
Frasure, Lorrie
Friedman, Elisabeth Jay
Garcia-Bedolla, Lisa
*Gelman, Andrew
Gillion, Daniel
Godrej, Farah
Haggard, Stephan
Haynie, Kerry
Henderson, Errol
Herrera, Yoshiko
Humphreys, Macartan
Hutchings, Vince
*Imai, Kosuke
Isiksel, Turkuler
Jacobs, Alan
Jamal, Amaney
Johnson, Juliet
Jones-Correa, Michael
*Keele, Luke
Kinsella, Helen M.
*Krupnikov, Yanna
Levin, Ines
Levy, Jacob T.
Lien, Pei-te
Lightfoot, Sheryl
Lokaneeta, Jinee
Lu, Catherine
Luna, Juan Pablo
Lust, Ellen
Lynch, Marc
MacLean, Lauren M.
Majic, Samantha
Manion, Melanie
Mares, Isabela
Martinez-Ebers, Valerie
Masket, Seth
Medie, Peace A.
Minta, Michael
Michener, Jamila
Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin
Moustafa, Tamir
*O’Brien, Diana
Orey, Byron D’Andra
Penn, Elizabeth Maggie
Perry, Ravi
Phillips, Justin
Pickup, Mark
Price, Melanye
Ramakrishnan, Karthick
Reinhardt, Gina Yannitell
Reynolds, Andrew
Ritter, Emily Hencken
Roberts, Molly
Rogers, Melvin
Rudra, Nita
*Sambanis, Nicholas
Savun, Burcu
Scheve, Ken
Schwartzberg, Melissa
Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine
Sen, Maya
Sharrow, Elizabeth
Sikkink, Kathryn
Sjoberg, Laura
Sokhey, Anand
Song, Sarah
Stolle, Dietlind
Thelen, Kathleen
Thies, Cameron
Thomas, Jakana
Townsend-Bell, Erica
Tungohan, Ethel
Vázquez-Arroyo, Antonio Y.
Wedeen, Lisa
Weeks, Jessica
White, Ismail K
Wolak, Jennifer
Wong, Janelle
Yashar, Deborah J.
Table A1. Board Members’ Substantive Areas of Research Expertise, 2022*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American politics</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative politics</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal theory</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International relations</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political theory</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and ethnicity</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality and politics</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Figures do not sum to 105, since many people contribute to multiple fields not easily designated as primary, secondary, etc. We report raw numbers in each field, since the total number of members is just over 100, and percentages are easy for the reader to estimate.

Advisory Board for Ethical Research (Subcommittee of APSR Board)
Catherine Boone
Scott Desposato
Macartan Humphreys
Lauren M. MacLean
Trisha Phillips
Peregrine Schwartz-Shea
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Star Reviewers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claire Adida</th>
<th>Jennifer Merolla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeb Barnes</td>
<td>Kevin Munger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Clifford</td>
<td>Mark Pickup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Copelovitch</td>
<td>Andrew Sabl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Druckman</td>
<td>Ken Scheve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Fowler</td>
<td>Todd Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirya Holman</td>
<td>Anand Sokhey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Jacobs</td>
<td>Kris Stella Trump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanna Krupnikov</td>
<td>James Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keisha Lindsay</td>
<td>Ismail White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asya Magazinnik</td>
<td>Abby Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
APSA Article Awards 2022

Heinz I. Eulau Award for best article published in the American Political Science Review and Perspectives on Politics in the previous calendar year

Award Committees: Dr. Erik Martinez Kuhonta (Chair), McGill University; Dr. Kristin Marie Bakke, University College London; Dr. Carles Boix, Princeton University; Dr. Benjamin I. Page, Northwestern University; Anastasia Shesterinina, The University of Sheffield

Recipients (APSR): Pavithra Suryanarayan, Johns Hopkins University; Steven White, Syracuse University

Section 5: Political Organizations and Parties
Jack Walker Award
The Jack Walker Award recognizes an article published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties.

Award Committee: Hye Young You (Chair), New York University; Mathias Poertner, London School of Economics; Brian Brox, Tulane University

Recipients: Alexandra E. Cirone, Cornell University; Gary W. Cox, Stanford University; Jon H. Fiva, Norwegian Business School

Section 8: Representation and Electoral Systems
Lawrence Longley Award
The Lawrence Longley Award is given to the best article on representation and electoral systems published in the previous year.

Award Committee: Nicholas Kerr (Chair), University of Florida; Soren Jordan, Auburn University; Bridgett King, Auburn University

Recipients: Timm Betz, Technical University of Munich; David Fortunato, University of California, San Diego; Diana O’Brien, Rice University

Honorable Mentions: Nikhar Gaikwad, Columbia University and Garreth Nellis, University of California, San Diego
Section 16: Women, Gender, and Politics Research
Section 17: Foundations of Political Theory
Susan Okin Iris Marion Young Award
The Okin-Young Award in Feminist Political Theory, co-sponsored by Women and Politics, Foundations of Political Theory, and the Women’s Caucus for Political Science, commemorates the scholarly, mentoring, and professional contributions of Susan Moller Okin and Iris Marion Young to the development of the field of feminist political theory. This annual award recognizes the best paper on feminist political theory published in an English language academic journal during the previous calendar year.

Award Committee: Lorna Bracewell (Chair), Flagler College; Susan Bickford, University of North Carolina; Arlene Saxonhouse, University of Michigan

Recipients: Kimberly Hutchings, Queen Mary University of London and Patricia Owens, University of Oxford

Section 21: European Politics and Society
Best Article Award
The Best Article Award is given for the best article dealing with European politics and society published in 2021.

Award Committee: Francesc Amat, University of Barcelona; Jordi Muñoz, University of Barcelona; Nan Zhang, University of Mannheim

Recipients: Florian Foos, London School of Economics and Daniel Bischof, Aarhus University

Honorable Mention: Lukas Haffert, University of Zurich

Section 22: State Politics and Policy
Best Journal Article Award
This annual award is given to the author(s) of the best journal article on U.S. state politics or policy published during the previous calendar year in any peer-reviewed journal (book reviews, review essays, and chapters published in edited volumes are not eligible).

Award Committee: Rene R. Rocha (Chair), University of Iowa; Laura Bucci, Saint Joseph’s University; Timothy H. Callaghan, Texas A&M University

Recipients: Gerald Gamm, University of Rochester and Thad Kousser, University of California, San Diego
Section 23: Political Communication
Walter Lippmann Best Published Article Award
The Walter Lippmann Best Published Article Award recognizes the best article published in the field of political communication in the previous calendar year.

Award Committee: Fabian Neuner (Chair), Arizona State University; Jason Coronel, Ohio State University; Jennifer Oser, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Recipients: Constantine Boussalis, Trinity College Dublin; Travis Coan, University of Exeter; Mirya Holman, Tulane University; Stefan Müller, University College Dublin
Title: “Gender, candidate emotional expression, and voter reactions during televised debates.” American Political Science Review 115(4): 1242-1257.

Section 25: Political Economy
Michael Wallerstein Award
Best published article in political economy in a peer-reviewed journal.

Award Committee: Pablo Beramendi (Chair), Duke University; Alex Fouirnaies, University of Chicago; Erica Owen, University of Pittsburgh

Co-recipients: Leonardo Baccini, McGill University and Stephen Weymouth, Georgetown University

Section 35: Democracy and Autocracy
Best Article Award
Single-authored or co-authored articles focusing on democratization and/or the development and dynamics of democracy and authoritarianism.
Award Committee: Sharan Grewal (Chair), College of William & Mary; Matthew Graham, George Washington University; Vilde Djuve, University of Oslo

Recipient: Agustina S. Paglayan, University of California, San Diego

Section 43: Migration and Citizenship
Best Article Award
Award for best article on migration and/or citizenship published (i.e., printed) in the previous calendar year.
Award Committee: Els de Graauw (Chair), Baruch College; Deborah Schildkraut, Tufts University; Fiona Adamson, SOAS University of London

Recipients: Yang-Yang Zhou, University of British Columbia and Andrew Shaver, University of California, Merced

Section 44: African Politics Conference Group
Best Article
Best article published in political science based in African empirics.

Award Committee: Marijke Breuning, University of North Texas; Hakeem Onapajo, Nile University, Abuja; Mike Omilusi; Ekiti State University, Nigeria

Recipient: Elizabeth Wellman, Williams College and University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg