

2012 Annual Report, *International Studies Quarterly*

The 2011-12 year was the Indiana University *ISQ* editorial team's fourth full year in office. Karen Rasler and William R. Thompson served as co-editors, with Thompson also serving as editor-in-chief and managing editor. Our current team includes Nicolas Blarel and Kentaro Sakuwa who are the main editorial assistants and Arwen Taylor who serves as a part time copy editor.

The following information summarizes the nature of our activities for the past year.

- Our mean response time (from submission to decision) was 54.6 calendar days.
- We processed 657 manuscripts. Of those, 56 were accepted and 89 were given revise and resubmit decisions. The total number of manuscripts represents a 0.15 percentage increase over 2010-2011 figures. At long last, we think we have hit a ceiling of sorts in terms of escalating submissions. Keep in mind that the 2010-2011 increase amounted to a 21.7 % change, 2009-2010 submission numbers represented a 24.2 % increase, just as the 2008-09 submission numbers constituted a 31.5% increase over 2007-08. All in all, submissions have doubled since we began editing *ISQ*.
- We received 263 (40%) submissions of all types from institutions in countries other than the United States. The proportion of non-U.S. submissions has been rising slowly over the past decade.
- Our acceptance rate was 8.5% percent of all submissions on which a decision was made. Since 2002, annual acceptance rates have ranged from a high of 17.5% to a low of 8.4% (with fluctuations up and down from year to year).
- Of the submissions to *ISQ*, 147 were authored by women. Another 81 submissions were co-authored papers in which at least one (but not all) of the co-authors was a woman. Women authors had a smaller percentage of their manuscripts accepted than male authors (6.8% versus 8.9%). However, joint teams (men and women co-authors) continued to do better than average. (9.9%).
- We requested reviews from 1682 reviewers, of whom 1091 responded positively (i.e., delivered reviews). 830 reviewers were male; 261 reviewers were female.

Trends

All information on trends in *ISQ* activity is subject to some problems of comparison over time. The two basic problems are that each editorial regime uses a different reporting period and some information tends to be lost in regime transition periods. Nonetheless, the following figures are

taken from earlier *ISQ* annual reports found on the web and provide some over time comparisons.

Table 1 reports turn-around times. Our third year average turn-around time appears to be fairly good. Note as well that we fail to include the month of August during which we do not send new submissions for external review (although, we do still make decisions on older papers). We doubt that the turn-around time will improve much more. Most editorial time these days is devoted to chasing reviewer commitments and then waiting for/encouraging them to actually deliver a review. The difficulties in securing enough reviewers to make the process work cannot be exaggerated. In some situations, we have asked 10-12 people in order to obtain 2 reviewers on board (although these types of cases are not yet the norm). The number of reviewer invitations that were extended numbered 1,614 this past year. Over a thousand (1,052) reviews were received. About one-fourth of these reviews were written by women (23.7%); this proportion also corresponds roughly to the number of submissions received from women authors.

Table 1: Turn-around Times in Average Days

2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
82.5	74.3	75.0	71.6	n.d.	76.8	65.9	58.1	54.6

Table 2 reports historical information on submission rates. Submissions did not increase this year. The trend line is quite clear. Since 1999-2000, the increase has been about 357%. There are certainly exogenous factors afoot to account for the increased activity (basically, more people around the world doing research and submitting articles for tenure and promotion) but one must conclude that *ISQ* is doing something right in the sense that more people are seeking publication in the journal.

Table 2: Submissions

1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
143	167	180	215	197	284	302	337	330	434	539	656
2011-2012											
657											

Table 3 indicates that some of the increase in submission activity emanates from non-US institutions. In fact, most parts of the world are contributing to the increasing number of submissions. Note that 2011-12 is the first year in which the number of US submissions has declined over the previous year.

Table 3: Submissions by Region

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Latin America & Caribbean	5	1	0	5	1	3	4	4
Africa	1	2	3	0	3	5	4	1
Mid East	6	5	6	12	16	16	21	24
Pacific	3	6	2	7	12	19	28	14
Europe	43	44	53	42	85	107	146	166
Asia	8	9	11	11	21	20	24	32
Canada	8	9	18	8	17	22	26	20
USA	153	165	188	196	291	347	403	394

Table 4 suggests that women have doubled their submission rates in the past few years and have reduced the gap between male and female acceptance rates (table 5). The gap was quite pronounced in 2002-2005. Since 2006, acceptance rates for both genders have been more similar. The unusually low acceptance rates in 2009-10 reflect an unusual amount of success on the part of joint gender submissions. In 2008-09, none of the joint gender submissions were accepted. In 2009-10, joint acceptance rates were 19.1%.

Table 4: Submissions by Gender

Gender	2002		2003		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011	-12
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Female	31	14	55	20	60	20	50	15	58	28	120	28	107	20	140	21	147	22
Male	163	76	196	73	220	73	256	77	243	74	297	68	390	72	437	67	429	65
Joint	21	10	18	7	22	7	26	8	29	9	26	6	42	8	79	12	81	12

Table 5: Percentage Acceptance Rates by Gender

	2002	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Female	10.7	6.1	6.7	8.3	8.6	8.9	5.6	6.4	6.8
Male	19.0	11.8	15.0	9.5	11.1	10.1	5.9	7.8	8.9

Problems

We began our editorial tenure with an inherited two-year backlog. Blackwell-Wiley helped us tremendously at the outset with a 20 percent increase in space that began in 2009. We were able to bring the backlog down to 1.5 years but we were unable to keep it at that size. As we watched our backlog move to 1.75 years and inch back towards 2 years this past year, we pursued several options. First, we requested more space from Wiley-Blackwell but our request was turned down. Instead, Wiley-Blackwell offered a different publication format which was intended to increase more publication space. Previously, *ISQ* had been printed in single column format. By moving to a double column format (in 2012), the new formatting strategy will give us approximately 100 additional pages per year. In addition, we reduced the maximum paper length from 12.5 to 11 thousand words beginning midway through the past year (grandfathering in papers already in the pipeline). Additional economies were introduced by eliminating some publishing procedures that wasted space. All credit is due to Wiley for looking for these ways to find us more space within the pages allotted. At the present time, the backlog is down to about 1.36 (or 5.5 issues). At this time, we are forced to reject papers that require major revisions with few exceptions. We are also experimenting with the strategy of eliminating research notes. Research notes are particularly troublesome because while they are pegged at half the length of regular papers, they invariably require more space (sometimes as much as half the length of a regular paper) due to the large number of tables in them.

Finally, we have also moved toward publishing accepted papers online in advance of the formal publication date. This strategy mollifies to some extent authors who are eager to see their work in print, and it enables us to know exactly how many printed pages each paper requires. Earlier, we had to guess. Consequently, we can maximize the space utilized in each issue more efficiently. We doubled the number of hours for our own copy editor but that made little headway in getting articles into the online pipeline. Wiley, very much to their credit, came up with the solution. At the present time, we are sending most accepted articles directly to the Wiley copy editor. As a consequence, 77 % of the 2013 articles that have been accepted are online or in the pipeline to be online within two weeks or so. The remainder are not online because we have yet to receive their final copies. Again, all kudos are due to Wiley for making this possible. Without their intervention, less than 25% would be online now. At some point, we hope to catch up with our backlog of accepted articles and place less pressure on their copy editing services – but we are not quite there yet.