Three issues have emerged during this past year which require some editorial comment and some clarification of editorial policy. First, the authors of a small number of articles have complained that their ideas had been “stolen” by authors of other articles. In some cases the individuals in question were reviewing a manuscript for the Review when they discovered this similarity of ideas; in other cases the potentially offending manuscript had been published in a current issue of the Review. Given the great diversity of problems being studied in political science and the equally wide range of methodologies, in the broadest sense of that term, that are being used, I found these reactions both startling and encouraging. The overlap of ideas and methodologies (even if stolen) has to say something about convergence and cumulation in the field. This situation has certainly been true in the natural sciences, where the rush to get new ideas into print and the fear of being scooped is intense, as is the recognition of key problems and basic approaches. But although this development may be a positive one for the discipline as a whole, it does signal possible problems for authors, particularly for young, untenured ones.

Consequently, beginning with this issue we will henceforth publish with each article the dates on which the manuscript was first received in our editorial offices and if revised, the date when the revised manuscript was received. Although this measure will not resolve all disputes of timing, it may help to clarify time sequence.

We will also publish the date when each article was accepted, which will provide readers with two additional facts: it will indicate how long it took to process the manuscript, i.e., the time elapsed between receipt and decision, and also some idea of cue waiting time, i.e., the time between decision date and date of publication.

Two caveats should be borne in mind to interpret this information properly. Journal editors in political science have in recent years attempted to provide authors with a turnaround time of less than three months. Although this is certainly a goal of the Review, it is only possible with complete referee cooperation. Sometimes this happens, but sometimes it does not. Especially in the more technical and very specialized areas as many as five or six individuals may decline to review a manuscript, and this combined with the fact that many referees take more than the standard four weeks to respond, often causes uncontrollable delays that extend the three-month processing period.

The second caveat concerns “waiting times.” It must be remembered that there is a four-month lag between the time we send an issue of the Review to the printer and the actual date of publication. One must then add approximately two months for editorial work, which means that manuscripts accepted for publication in March of a given year can at best appear in a December issue, depending upon the existing backlog of publishable manuscripts.

A second problem of concern involves our policy regarding communications. As editors before me have discovered, the volume of communications can at times be excessive, so much so that space for articles may be threatened. I think most readers would agree that the emphasis of the Review should be on articles, not communications. Chuck Jones initiated a policy that I have followed; all communications, like manuscripts, are refereed, and only those that have received referee endorsement are published, which helps to regulate communication flows. Communications, however, typically question or attack previously published articles, and when these letters are accepted for publication, authors feel they have a right to respond and indeed that their responses should appear in the same or the subsequent issue. To attempt to do so this would, however, open Pandora’s box. We will therefore adopt the following policy. A communication involving a previously published article will be sent to the authors of the article in question. The authors will be asked whether they wish to respond and given two weeks to do so. The package, communication plus author response, will then be submitted to the regular referee process. Referees will be asked to determine whether both items, only the communication, or neither item should be published. If authors do not respond within two weeks, the communication will be submitted to the normal referee process.

Every so often we receive articles that raise...
questions about the work of one or more researchers. These articles tend to raise broad philosophical issues and so are not treated in the same manner as communications. If it appears that an interesting dialogue could develop, then those whose work has been questioned may be contacted for a response. Again there is no guarantee that the response will be published, since it is subject to the review process, but if the response is favorably reviewed, we will attempt to publish both article and response in the same issue.

The third problem that seems to recur continually is that of duplicate submission and publication. It should be clear to authors that when they submit an article to any political science journal, they can only submit that article to one journal at a time. The Review acknowledgment of receipt clearly stipulates this understanding. My discussions with other journal editors indicate a common feeling that violations of this basic ethical principle should be penalized, perhaps by refusing to process further manuscripts by the author in question and by informing other journal editors of the problem.

The problem of multiple submissions, however, has some grey areas, one of which concerns edited volumes. Sometimes an author has submitted an article to the Review and after the article has been accepted, he or she is invited to submit the article to an edited volume. Although it seems unfair to use up the very limited space of the Review for an article that will eventually appear elsewhere, if the article has been accepted by the Review before the invitation to be included in the edited volume, it is reasonable to proceed with publication in the Review. However, it is not fair to have the article reviewed simultaneously by the Review and an edited volume.

The second grey area concerns extensions of previously published work. Occasionally submitted articles are very similar but not identical to previously published articles or books by the same author. The authors in question claim that the new manuscript is an extension of the earlier work. This is probably the most difficult of all grey areas, and I can see no clear recourse except to request that authors make it clear either in the newly submitted material or in a covering letter that the new article is an extension of an earlier publication. Referees will then be asked whether the most recent study is indeed a major contribution beyond what is already in print.

I hope I have clarified some policy points that have troubled authors and readers. Let me conclude by indicating that with this December issue we are once again publishing the names of those who have helped the Review during the past year. We can't thank these individuals enough for their tireless efforts; without their help there could be no American Political Science Review.

Managing Editor

DINA ZINNES

We are grateful to the following scholars who have served the Review as anonymous referees during the period from July 1, 1982 through June 30, 1983.


Pedro A. Caban, Naomi Caiden, Jerry W. Calvert, Randall Calvert, David Cameron, Roderic A. Camp, Blair Campbell, Bruce A. Campbell,
1983


George H. Quester.


Sidney Ulmer, Eric M. Uslaner.

Sidney Verba.

The following articles have tentatively been scheduled for publication in the March, 1984 issue:

- B. E. Cain, J. A. Ferejohn, and M. P. Fiorina, "The Constituency Service Basis of the Personal Vote for U.S. Representatives and British Members of Parliament"
- W. Claggett, W. Flanigan, and N. Zingale, "Nationalization of the American Electorate"
- H. Daalder, "In Search of the Center of European Party Systems"
- J. Garand and D. A. Gross, "Changes in the Vote Margins for Congressional Candidates: A Specification of Historical Trends"
- D. S. Lutz, "The Relative Influence of European Writers on Late Eighteenth-Century American Political Thought"
- M. A. Mosher, "The Particulars of a Universal Politics: Hegel's Adaptation of Montesquieu's Typology"
- M. Muramatsu and E. S. Krauss, "Bureaucrats and Politicians in Policymaking: The Case of Japan"
- J. M. Orbell, P. Schwartz-Shea, and R. T. Simmons, "Do Cooperators Exist More Readily than Defectors?"
- W. Riker, "The Heresthetics of Constitution-Making: A Presidency in 1787 with Comments on Determinism and Rational Choice"
- R. H. Salisbury, "Interest Representation: The Dominance of Institutions"
- Smith, R. A. "Advocacy, Interpretation and Influence in the U.S. Congress"
- R. Sugden, "Free Association and the Theory of Proportional Representation"