

Perspectives on Politics

Guidelines for Book Reviews

The primary function of the Book Review is to offer informative, critical and fair discussion of the most important newly-published books in political science. Such discussion requires that reviews be clearly written for a **general audience of political scientists**. The Review Editor reads and line-edits each review carefully for grammar and style as well as substance. If reviews need revision, they will be returned with clear instructions. ***We only publish reviews that are well-written, according to the criteria described in our invitation and commission letters.*** We take these formal letters very seriously, because they lay out the basic criteria according to which all reviews will be judged and edited by our staff. ***Space limitations*** are serious in a periodical in which space is a precious commodity. ***Deadlines*** are serious in a profession that values currency and that prizes the honoring of professional commitments.

Book reviews should not simply describe books. They should explain to readers how the books in question address serious theoretical debates within political science, and speak to broad questions of interest to political science and social science more generally. All reviews should say something about the way the books purport to contribute to scholarly knowledge and how successful the books are in comparison to other relevant research. In considering these questions, the book's treatment of relevant literatures and authors is particularly germane to your evaluation. If you have concerns about citation bias, regarding gender, people of color, or other under-represented scholarly communities, these would also be worth noting. Obviously, your evaluation will be based largely on your reading of the work as a scholarly expert. But please keep in mind that *Perspectives on Politics* is a distinctive kind of political science journal, and seeks to promote research that is integrative and that reaches broadly within political science. Critical reviews should clearly identify the main themes or theses of the book in question before proceeding to criticize it. It is important that criticism of books centers on the principal **scholarly** purposes, as well as merits or demerits, of the books.

Please note: AI may not be used for any content creation in book reviews. If the editors suspect the use of AI to generate content within the book review, it is at their discretion to reject the review.

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 words with 500-word responses; Symposia, 1000 words; 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 title, author name, publisher and location, date of publication, and number of pages. In the case of multiple books, these headings should be listed alphabetically by the authors' last names.

Your name, institutional affiliation and country, 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.

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

Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics. By Anthony Giddens. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 200p.

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

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

- **No footnotes/endnotes are permitted in the book reviews.**
- When making general reference to other scholars, please include 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 first and last name; journal title; season/month/number; and year of publication.

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 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 *Perspectives* style, format, and space limitations. Reviewers are responsible for correct presentation of factual material (including correct spelling of proper names, accurate page numbers for quotes, etc.).

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 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, for deadlines to be kept.** Production schedules, and the efficient operations of our discipline, require this. Your cooperation in this is greatly appreciated.