

# PERSPECTIVES ON POLITICS

## Article Types

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

The front end of the journal consists primarily of peer-reviewed articles. These articles are all submitted for review through the electronic 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 two or three 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 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.

*Perspectives* articles can be as long as 10,000 words (approximately 13 journal pages).

**Everything published in the front end of the journal is a peer-reviewed scholarly article.**

And only individual articles (whether individually written or co-authored) will be considered for publication by unsolicited submission and peer review. In the past, the journal tried to review groups of articles, jointly submitted together as symposia, through the peer review process. This created many logistical difficulties, all of which followed from the tension between the principle of peer review—that each individual piece of research be judged on its merits—and the effort to pre-package pieces of research. This practice has been discontinued. *Perspectives* will continue to run symposia (see below), but these will be developed by the editor-in-chief, typically through solicitation and in consultation with editorial board members. Only individual pieces of research—whether individually or collaboratively written—will be published in the front end of *Perspectives*, and there will be no doubt that each and every piece of research published there has gone through and survived a serious peer review process.

The back end of *Perspectives* consists of a range of essays, comments, symposia, review essays, and book reviews. These works are all developed and edited by the editor-in-chief in consultation with the editorial staff and with members of the editorial board. While the editor welcomes queries and suggestions, and will answer all such communications promptly, only individual research articles intended for publication in the “Articles” section can expect formalized processes of review.

The journal has long included a “Perspectives” section, where authors may offer short, sharp commentaries on a political phenomenon or policy problem; engage scholarly arguments to highlight methodological or substantive disagreements; or provide insightful discussion of other works of interest to political scientists. “Perspectives” contributions typically range from 4,000–5,500 words (5–7 journal pages). **Such pieces will continue to be published, at the back end of the journal, in a section newly named “Reflections.”** The journal has always considered unsolicited commentaries, and it will continue to do so. But these pieces will not be subject to a double-blind peer review process, and they will be evaluated, developed, and edited by the editor-in-chief in accordance with editorial priorities and judgments (in making these judgments, the editor-in-chief works closely with the editorial staff and the editorial board). At the same time, all “Reflections” authors will receive prompt written responses from the editor-in-chief explaining the dispensation of their work.

The back end of *Perspectives* also contains what was previously the “Book Reviews” section, and it will be run and edited in the same way in which the book review was run for the past four years. This section will contain four different kinds of pieces:

- Review essays address a small set of books, articles, or other “texts” in order to consider how these materials 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 8,000 words (10 journal pages). Review essays are developed in consultation with the editor-in-chief, and are typically solicited by the editor-in-chief.
- Symposia bring together a range of commentators to discuss a common theme or text. Most symposia are organized around one or more recently published books, which are viewed as occasions for reflecting on broader issues (such as inequality, terrorism, civic engagement, racism, or civil liberty). Symposia are solicited and developed by the editor-in-chief, in consultation and collaboration with the editorial board. *Perspectives* will no longer accept unsolicited symposia for publication through the Editorial Manager system.
- Critical dialogues typically bring into conversation two invited authors who engage similar topics or themes from different theoretical, methodological, or subfield perspectives. Each author will review the other’s book, and then respond to the other’s review. These exchanges are designed to invite authors to reach beyond their comfort zones and to constructively engage different perspectives, including perspectives that normal disciplinary markers often keep segregated from one another.
- Finally, book reviews typically review one, two, or three books. *Perspectives* book reviews seek to relate books under review to broader scholarly literatures and political debates, and thus help nurture a common literary culture among political scientists. They place a premium on clear writing for a broad scholarly readership. The journal does not accept unsolicited reviews, nor does it accept requests to review particular books. All reviews are commissioned and edited by the editor-in-chief.