

# *Perspectives on Politics*

## **Guidelines for Book Reviews**

The primary function of the book review is to offer an informative, critical and fair evaluation of important newly published books in political science. Reviews should be clearly written for a **general audience of political scientists**, even as they may draw on specialized debates within particular subfields. The Review Editors read each review carefully and expect that reviews are checked for grammar and style prior to submission. If reviews need revision, they will be returned with clear instructions. ***We only publish reviews that are well written and which abide by the criteria described in our invitation and commission letters.*** Thus, we reserve the right to reject reviews. Space is a precious commodity in the journal, and the Book Review Editors take seriously the specified word count. ***Deadlines*** are to be followed strictly.

Book reviews should not simply describe books. They should explain to readers how these books address serious theoretical debates in the field and speak to broader questions of interest within political science and social science more generally. All reviews should say something about the book's purported contribution and should critically evaluate how successfully the author makes their case, in comparison to other scholarship in the field. In considering these questions, you may want to consider how the book engages (or fails to) with relevant literatures and other authors. If you have concerns about any citation bias against women, people of color, LGBTQ+ authors, or other under-represented scholarly communities, this would also be worth noting. Critical reviews should clearly identify the main themes or theses of the book in question before proceeding to critique. It is important that such criticism centers on the principal **scholarly** purposes of the book, as well as its strengths or limitations. While we value fair criticism, please speak to us before writing a review if your evaluation is mostly negative.

Obviously, your review will be based mainly on your reading of the work as a scholarly expert. However, *Perspectives on Politics* is a distinctive kind of political science journal in that it seeks to promote research that is integrative and that speaks to a broad audience within political science. So please keep in mind that you may need to explain specialist knowledge and contextualize any subfield-specific debates for a more general reader.

### **Timeliness**

We are all scholarly authors as well as book reviewers. We all value prompt review of our work, and we all know how upsetting and even damaging it can be when our work is not reviewed expeditiously. The editorial staff therefore assumes that all commissioned reviewers understand **how important it is, to the authors in question and to the profession, to keep the assigned review deadlines.** Production schedules and the efficient operations of our discipline require this. Your cooperation in this is greatly appreciated, especially as we generally commission and publish reviews thematically.

### **Submission and Word Count**

**Book Reviews should be submitted through the Editorial Manager system.** The documents should be saved in **Microsoft Word** and should be **double-spaced**. Single book reviews should target 1200 words; double reviews, 1600 words; triple reviews, 2000 words; Critical Dialogues, 1500-word initial reviews with 500-word responses; Symposia, 1000 words per contributor; and Review Essays, 4000-5000 words.

Please note: We do not commission multiple single reviews. **If you received two or three books**, you have agreed to **jointly** review the material. This will require some level of synthesis and creativity, given the space constraints described above.

## Format

Your review must include the book title, author name, publisher and location, date of publication, number of pages, and the price of the book. In the case of multiple books, these headings should be listed alphabetically by the authors' last names.

Your name, institutional affiliation, and institutionally affiliated email address should appear, right-justified. The following are examples of the proper format:

**The New American Politics: Reflections on Political Change and the Clinton Administration.**

Edited by Bryan D. Jones. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995. 316p. \$65.00 cloth, \$24.95 paper.

Nicol C. Rae, *Florida International University*  
email@institutionalaffiliation.edu

**Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics.** By Anthony Giddens. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 200p. \$39.50 cloth, \$14.95 paper.

**Brazilian Industrialists and Democratic Change.** By Leigh A. Payne. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994. 216p. \$32.50 cloth.

Frances Hagopian, *Tufts University*  
email@institutionalaffiliation.edu

## Please note:

- **No footnotes or endnotes are permitted in the book reviews.**
- When making general reference to other scholars, please include their first names.
- Extensive quotations should be avoided.

**All quotations from the book(s) under review must be accompanied by the page numbers. You should avoid excessive citations of other works within your book review(s).** If you do cite other books, provide the title, author name, and date of publication in the text. If citing articles, please provide enough information in the citation to identify the work, including the author's first and last name, journal title, season/month/number, and year of publication. **We discourage reviewers from citing their own work unless this is deemed essential.**

The following are examples of the proper format for within-text citations of other works:

In the tradition of Robert Dahl's (1960) *Who Governs...*

This analysis is part of an extensive tradition (e.g., see Donald L. Horowitz, *The Courts and Social Policy*, 1977)

This concept has been expressed by Manin in other works (Bernard Manin, "On Legitimacy and Political Deliberation," *Political Theory*, 15(3), 1987).

This argument has been made most recently by Andrew C. Janos ("Social Science, Communism, and the Dynamics of Political Change," in Nancy Bermeo, ed., *Liberalization and Democratization*, 1992).

*Perspectives* regards the submission of your review as confirmation that your review has not appeared nor will appear elsewhere in published form. We shall notify you if substantial cuts or changes are needed in your review.

**Otherwise, your review will be copyedited for grammar and syntax and to meet the *Perspectives* style, format, and space limitations.** Reviewers are responsible for the correct presentation of factual material (including the correct spelling of proper names, accurate page numbers for quotes, etc.).