

PERSPECTIVES ON POLITICS

Article Types

Perspectives on Politics publishes several types of articles, organized into distinct sections.

The front end of the journal consists of peer-reviewed articles, with the exception of the annual presidential address. Articles are all submitted for review through the [Editorial Manager](#) system. All submitted articles are reviewed in-house, and then those deemed broadly consistent with the editorial purposes and philosophy of the journal are sent out to four external reviewers. Both in-house and external evaluation processes involve double-blind review.

Contributions to the “Articles” section generally follow the traditional conventions for academic journal articles. *Perspectives* articles are typically works of original research or creative syntheses of such works. Drawing on authors’ scholarly expertise, they engage theoretical literatures in order to address important political issues or phenomena. In keeping with the journal’s distinctive mission, these articles ought to be well-written and addressed to a broad readership of political scientists, social scientists more generally, civic leaders, and policymakers. There is no one-size-fits-all model for *Perspectives* articles, but **articles should represent high-end research that is broader and more integrative than the research published by more specialized disciplinary and sub-disciplinary journals**. As part of the Editorial Manager submission process, we ask that all prospective authors submit a brief explanation of why they have chosen to submit their work to *Perspectives* and how it is consistent with the distinctive mission and audience of our journal.

Articles can be as long as 12,000 words. This word count includes the main body of the text, as well as notes and in-text citations. It does not include the title page, abstract, bibliography, tables, figures, mathematical notations, online appendices or other supporting information. Most of our space is devoted to individual articles (whether individually written or co-authored) chosen through unsolicited submission and peer review. The editorial team might also experiment with calls for papers on topics of broad interest to the discipline. Those opportunities will be broadly advertised and are open to all potential authors and will follow normal submission procedures. The journal is not opposed to articles jointly submitted on a common theme, but each and every submission will be evaluated individually and will have to pass muster through the peer review system.

The journal has long included a “Reflections” section. Reflections typically range from 6,000-10,000 words (with word count including the main body of the text, notes and in-text citations, and excluding the title page, abstract, bibliography, tables, figures, mathematical notations, online appendices or other supporting information). They are sent out for peer review and must pass peer review. Reflections are contemplative, provocative, or programmatic essays that address important political science questions and controversies in interesting ways. Within these submissions, authors might offer short, sharp commentaries on a political phenomenon or policy problem; engage scholarly arguments to highlight methodological or substantive disagreements; put forth new perspectives, concepts, methods, research agendas, or descriptive analyses; or provide insightful discussion of other issues of importance for politics and political science. Reflection essays are not lesser than traditional research articles, but different. They offer a space where scholars can make important innovations and interventions, but can do so without the format, structure, or length standard in research articles. For example, these pieces might forego a detailed literature review or the extensive data analysis requisite for hypothesis-testing. However, they should make clear contributions to political science and/or political science’s engagement in the public sphere.

The back end of *Perspectives* consists of Review Essays, Symposia, Critical Dialogues, and Book Reviews. These works are all commissioned and edited by the Book Review Editor in consultation with the editorial staff.

- **Review Essays** address two or more books in order to consider how they illuminate a larger conceptual, political, or normative concern. Such essays typically bring a range of texts into dialogue with one another, identifying both thematic commonalities and methodological differences. Review essays vary in length, averaging about 4,000 words. Review essays are solicited by the Book Review Editor.
- **Symposia** bring together a range of commentators to discuss a single book from multiple perspectives. Symposia are solicited and developed by the Book Review Editor. *Perspectives* does not accept unsolicited symposia for publication through the Editorial Manager system.
- **Critical Dialogues** typically bring into conversation the authors of two recent books which engage similar topics or themes. Each author reviews the other’s book, and then responds to the other’s review.
- **Book Reviews** typically address one, two, or three books. *Perspectives* book reviews seek to relate books under review to broader scholarly literatures and political debates.