

PERSPECTIVES ON POLITICS

Instructions for Reviewers

If you are unfamiliar with *Perspectives on Politics* it might be helpful to review some of the documents regarding Submissions and the Editorial Process, accessible at the Perspectives webpage.

We use the familiar double-blind review process. That means we do not reveal to the author(s) the identity of referees. Likewise we do not reveal to you the identity of the author(s) of this manuscript. (You are not automatically disbarred from the review process if you believe you do know the identity of the author(s). If that is the case, please let us know.) This arrangement is intended to facilitate frank, independent assessment of all submissions. We hope you will provide your full and candid judgment of the manuscript.

- Can the manuscript be published as is, or with only cosmetic changes?
- Can the manuscript be published with only minor revisions? If so, what changes are necessary?
- Does the manuscript require significant changes in order to clear the threshold of publication? Again, what changes are necessary?
- Should the manuscript be rejected? If so, what are the primary reasons for your judgment?

Because we aspire to reach a broad audience, we are especially concerned with the argumentative structure—both stylistic and substantive—of the papers we publish. With that in mind, here are some specific questions to help guide you as you assess this manuscript.

- Is the empirical evidence on which the argument builds sound? Are there sorts of evidence that might make the argument stronger or, conversely, that you feel will weaken it?
- Is the interpretation of any empirical evidence that is provided plausible? Are there competing interpretations that the authors overlook?
- Does the manuscript fairly present and address relevant counter-arguments? Are there plausible counter-arguments that it overlooks?
- Is the argument presented clearly? Can you suggest ways to improve the writing and visual elements (i.e., graphs, tables, etc.)? Are there technical aspects of the argument that might be moved to appendices? Does the manuscript rely too heavily on arcane terminology or jargon?

- Does the author properly situate her argument in relevant literatures? Is the paper properly documented? Does it rely too heavily or not heavily enough on footnotes? submission.