

Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique

2012 End-of-year Report
April 16, 2013

Prepared by Graham White (English Co-editor)

This is the first annual report on the *Journal/Revue* on behalf of the English editorial team at Ryerson University and the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM). Our operation is funded by generous contributions from the Association, from Ryerson University, from UTM and from the University of Toronto's Graduate Department of Political Science. The *Journal/Revue* is also supported by a subvention from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

The new team – Graham White (UTM), Co-editor; Carolyn Johns (Ryerson), Assistant Editor; Peter Loewen (UTM), Assistant Editor; and Bryan Evans (Ryerson), Book Review Editor – officially took over on July 1st. The transition was a smooth one, due in large measure to the extensive briefing and advice from outgoing Co-editor Jim Kelly and the other members of the editorial team. We are very grateful to Professor Kelly and his colleagues.

If the transition was smooth, we did encounter a fairly steep learning curve, for example in managing the review process and becoming familiar with the powerful but complex “Editorial Manager” software. In this regard, as in others, the staff at Cambridge University Press were highly professional and supportive.

Our efforts have been greatly assisted by the strong work of our Editorial Assistants, Jack Lucas at UTM and Thomas McDowell at Ryerson.

This report covers the English-language component of the *Journal/Revue*. Information on the French-language side may be found in the report of French Co-editor, Daniel Salée.

Before presenting data on various aspects of the *Journal/Revue*'s operations, three significant impending changes warrant mention.

First, the Board of the Association is proposing that henceforth the basic subscription to the *Journal/Revue* include only electronic access to the *Journal/Revue* and that those wishing to receive paper copies will be required to pay an additional amount. This proposal will be put to the Association membership at the June meetings.

Second, SSHRC is moving towards support for open access principles for academic research. This will likely include the imposition of open access requirements on journals to which SSHRC provides financial support. Timelines for such a policy change are unclear. As well, “open access” may take a number of forms. All told, it is not yet possible to determine how the move to open access will affect the *Journal/Revue* but it is clear that significant change is in the offing.

Third, in partnership with Cambridge University Press, the *Journal/Revue* will shortly be adopting a “First View” approach, whereby accepted articles will be posted on the *Journal/Revue*'s web site as soon as they are copyedited. Given our substantial backlog, this will make accepted articles available several months before the issue in which they are to appear is actually published.

As in years past, the biggest challenge in 2012 was reviewer fatigue, in terms both of assessing manuscripts and reviewing books. In 2012, fewer than half (198 of 455) of the invitations to review manuscripts resulted in completed reviews. Once a reviewer agreed to assess a manuscript, the average time taken to complete a review was 37.7 days, though this figure disguises a wide variation: close to 30 per cent (61/218) of reviews completed in 2012 took over 50 days. Since we normally solicit three reviews on each manuscript, a single overdue assessment can significantly add to the time required to reach a decision (see below). The situation was even more trying on the book review side. It was not unusual for several invitations to review a book to be made before a reviewer was found.*

At the same time, we continue to be impressed and grateful for the time and insight that reviewers contribute. The typical manuscript review is extensive, thoughtful and helpful to authors, even in cases where the ultimate editorial decision is negative.

Overall, the data contained in this report present a picture of continuity with previous years' operations. Various indicators have changed marginally since last year, but no dramatic or significant changes are evident. Tables 1 to 4 present data on authors, reviewers and submissions.

Between January 1 and December 31, 2012 the English editorial team received a total of 101 new manuscripts (90 original studies, 8 research notes and 3 field reviews), including Professor Reeta Tremblay's Presidential Address. In the four issues of Volume 44, some 27 articles were published in English. This number is somewhat lower than in 2011, when 34 articles were published; however, a direct comparison is misleading, in that two issues in 2011 contained no French articles whereas each issue in 2012 had two French articles.

The average number of days from submission to first decision was 73 days for original submissions, up marginally from 2011 (72 days). For research notes, the first decision took on average 47 days (51 days in 2011); the decision on the one field review took 7 days (28 days in 2011).

Table 1, which shows the geographic source of manuscripts, demonstrates that the *Journal/Revue* continues to benefit from strong international attention, with nearly a third of all submissions coming from outside Canada. Within Canada, Ontario was the largest single source of submissions, followed by Quebec.

Table 2 presents a breakdown of the articles published in 2012 by the subfields used by the Association at the annual conference. Placement of articles is somewhat arbitrary; for example, all four the articles categorized as "Political Behaviour/Sociology" might have been considered as "Canadian Politics" since the cases and data they examined were largely or entirely Canadian.

The distribution of the 95 first decisions rendered in 2012 is presented in Table 3 The final disposition of the 101 submissions received in 2012 is presented in Table 4. (Note that first decisions would include some manuscripts submitted in 2011.) The initial rejection rate – 75 per cent – was somewhat higher than in the previous year (62 per cent). Of the 20 'R&R' initial decisions in 2012, 14

*The apparently inconsistent numbers for total manuscript reviews in this paragraph illustrate an important point about the data in this report. Most data are presented are for the 2012 calendar year. Since the *Journal/Revue* is an ongoing operation, the processing of many manuscripts spans two calendar years, so that data must be understood as a snapshot of a continuous process. In this instance the explanation for the apparent inconsistency is that some of the 218 reviews completed in 2012 would have been solicited in 2011.

were ultimately accepted, 2 were rejected, 1 was withdrawn by the author and 3 were still awaiting a final decision at the time of writing.

In terms of final decisions on the 101 submissions in 2012, since all 8 for which no final decision had been made at the time of writing had received a ‘revise and resubmit’ first decision, a substantial proportion of them are likely to be accepted. Accordingly, the overall acceptance rate will likely be in the range of 23 to 25 per cent.

Table 5 presents data on gender for articles published, manuscripts submitted, and reviewers invited and completed. Thirty per cent of first authors of 2012 articles were women, down from 41 per cent in 2011. Women submitted 29 per cent of the new manuscripts in 2012, as compared with 34 per cent in 2011. The percentage of invitations to review manuscripts that went to women was essentially unchanged from the previous year: 29 per cent in 2012, 28 per cent in 2011.

Tables 6 to 8 present data on book reviews published in 2012. As noted above, identifying book reviewers is a challenging task. The English book review team (Review Editor Bryan Evans and Editorial Assistant Thomas McDowell) have endeavoured to identify potential book reviewers through a variety of means. This spring, 316 academics were contacted and invited to consider writing a review and to identify graduate students who may be interested in doing reviews. To provide some indication of the significance of the challenge, only seven positive responses were obtained. In addition, members of the *Journal/Revue*'s Editorial Advisory Board have also been asked to consider writing reviews and to bring forward the names of graduate students interested in reviewing books.

Table 1 / Tableau 1
Geographical Location of Authors and Assessors /
Répartition géographique des auteurs et des évaluateurs
New Manuscripts / Nouveaux manuscrits*
January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012 / 1^{er} janvier 2012 au 31 décembre 2012

	Authors/Auteurs* English/Anglais	Assessors Requested/ Évaluateurs à qui on a demandé English/Anglais
British Columbia / Colombie-Britannique	3	22
Prairies	2	39
Ontario	11	146
Québec	5	33
Atlantic / Atlantique	1	16
USA / É.-U.	3	146
Europe	1	40
Other/Autre	1	13
TOTAL	27	455

*The numbers in the second column refer to the geographic location of the first author of each new manuscript. / Les chiffres dans la deuxième colonne réfèrent à la région géographique du premier auteur de chaque manuscrit.

Table 2 / Tableau 2
Manuscripts Published by Field / Manuscrits publiés par domaine
January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012 / 1^{er} janvier 2012 au 31 décembre 2012

Canadian Politics and Institutions Politique et institutions canadiennes	3
Political Theory / Théorie politique	1
International Relations and Canadian Foreign Policy Relations internationales et politique étrangère canadienne	3
Comparative Politics and Institutions Politique et institutions comparées	5
Local and Urban Politics / Politique locale et urbaine	1
Political Behaviour/Sociology / Comportement politique/sociologie	4
Political Economy / Économie politique	0
Provincial and Territorial Politics Politique provinciale et territoriale	0
Public Administration / Administration publique	3
Law and Public Policy Droit et analyse de politiques	3
Women, Gender and Politics Femmes, genre et politique	2
Race, Ethnicity, Indigenous People and Politics Race, peuples autochtones et politique	2
TOTAL	27

Table 3 / Tableau 3
First Decisions in 2012 / Premières décisions en 2012

Total	95
Rejected without review / Rejetés sans évaluation	28
Rejected after review/ Rejetés après évaluation	43
Accepted by assessors / Acceptés par les évaluateurs	4
Revise and resubmit / À réviser et à resoumettre	20

Table 4 / Tableau 4
Final Disposition of New Manuscripts Submitted in 2012 /
Décisions finales au sujet des nouveaux manuscrits soumis en 2012

Manuscripts Submitted / Manuscrits soumis	101
Rejected without review / Rejetés sans évaluation	28
Rejected after review/ Rejetés après évaluation	47
Accepted / Acceptés	17
Withdrawn by authors / Retirés par des auteurs	1
Withdrawn by editors / Retirés par les directeurs	0
Under review (as of April 15, 2013) / En cours d'évaluation (au 15 avril 2013)	8

Table 5 / Tableau 5
Gender Distribution of Authors and Assessors in 2012 /
Répartition des auteurs et des évaluateurs selon les sexes 2012

	Authors / Auteurs		Assessors / Évaluateurs
	Published / Publiés	Submitted / Soumis	
Female / Femme	8	29	133
Male / Homme	19	72	322
TOTAL	27	101	455

Table 6 / Tableau 6
2011 English Book Reviews - Fields / Recensions de livres en anglais en 2011 - Domaines

Canadian Politics and Institutions / Politique et institutions canadiennes	2
Political Theory / Théorie politique	3
International Relations and Canadian Foreign Policy / Relations internationales et politique étrangère canadienne	8
Comparative Politics and Institutions / Politique et institutions comparées	1
Local and Urban Politics / Politique locale et urbaine	0
Political Behaviour/Sociology / Comportement politique/sociologie	3
Political Economy / Économie politique	0
Provincial and Territorial Politics / Politique provinciale et territoriale	3
Public Administration / Administration publique	0
Law and Public Policy / Droit et analyse de politiques	2
Women, Gender and Politics / Femmes, genre et politique	3
Total	30

Table 7 / Tableau 7
Geographical Distribution of Reviewers, 2012 / Répartition géographique des critiques,
2012

British Columbia / Colombie-Britannique	1
Prairies	3
Ontario	8
Québec	6
Atlantic / Atlantique	2
United States / États-Unis	0
Europe	5
Other / Autre	0
TOTAL	30

Table 8 / Tableau 8
Gender Distribution of Reviewers 2012 / Répartition des critiques selon les sexes, 2012

Male / Homme	19
Female / Femme	11
TOTAL	30