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Executive Summary

The Michigan State University and University of Konstanz editorial team present this report for *International Interactions*. This report discusses stewardship of the journal from August 1, 2016 to July 31, 2017. During this reporting period:

- The editorial teams handled 283 manuscripts.\(^1\) Of these, 202 were original submission manuscripts (71.4%), while 81 were revised and resubmitted manuscripts. 255 manuscripts, of the total number of handled manuscripts, were received from August 1, 2016 through July 31, 2017, and they represent the manuscript flow during that time period. By July 31, 2017, we rendered a decision on 225 of these manuscripts, with 30 remaining manuscripts which were still awaiting decision at the end of the reporting period. The handling of 283 manuscripts from 2016-2017 shows a decrease in volume from the 311 manuscripts handled by the editorial team in the 2015-2016 year. Of the 311 manuscripts in the 2015-2016 year, 205 were original submission manuscripts (about 66%), while 106 were revised and resubmitted manuscripts, showing that the composition of original manuscripts increased compared to the previous year.

- Of the total number of handled manuscripts which received a decision *during* the annual reporting window, 168 manuscripts were sent for external review. 129 manuscripts were original submissions, while the rest (n=39) were revised manuscripts. As for the original submissions, the editors issued a rejection for 69.78% (90/129) and issued revised and resubmit invitations for 29.46% (38/129). The editors eventually accepted 19.5% of all externally reviewed submissions during this period (after revised and resubmitted manuscripts are factored in\(^2\)). Overall, 11.31% of the total number of handled manuscripts (n=283) was accepted during the period (n=32), including revise and resubmit manuscripts.

- Our mean response time (from an author’s submission until a decision is rendered) for all manuscripts with decisions rendered during the annual reporting period, including internally reviewed, externally reviewed, and manuscripts declined without review, was 36 calendar days; our median response time was 37 calendar days. Our shortest response time was 0 days – for manuscripts declined

---

\(^1\) 329 can include multiple decisions made over time on the same manuscript. For example, “Major Revision,” “Conditional Accept,” “Accept.”

\(^2\) In other words, this does not multiple count the same manuscript through the review process.
• For each new manuscript, we sent an average of 5.52 review requests. We received an average of 2.64 confirmations from reviewers of their intention to review for us on each new manuscript. Finally, we received an average of 2.18 reviews for each new manuscript. The maximum number of requests sent for a single manuscript was 16. The minimum number of days a reviewer took to return a review was 0. The maximum number of days a reviewer took to return a review was 75. We sent 33.87% of requests to women reviewers. Women reviewers have similar rates of acceptance of review requests as males and similar rates of completing reviews.

• Concerning the authors of original manuscripts that went through external review, 22.66% were females. The remaining 77.34% of authors of original manuscripts that were reviewed were males. Women authors were rejected 73.91% of the time after review, while 26.09% received an invite to revise and resubmit. In contrast, males were rejected 71.34% of the time after review, and offered an opportunity to revise and resubmit 28.66% of the time.

• The average number of days from the time a manuscript is formally accepted for publication until it appears online is 27 days, with a median of 17 days. This compares with a mean of 53 days from the previous year, showing a notable decline in the time for online appearance.

3 The following percentages are based on all authors, not just first authors.
Journal Statistics, August 2016-July 2017

The data that follow are from manuscripts handled by the Michigan State University and University of Konstanz editorial team during the reporting period from August 1, 2016 to July 31, 2017. Submission data includes all manuscripts received by July 31, 2017. A manuscript is only included in the data on response time and reviewer requests if the editors rendered a decision on the manuscript by July 31, 2016. Most figures refer to manuscripts that were submitted from August 1, 2015 to July 31, 2016, however, when necessary, we also report figures referring to manuscripts that were decided within the August 1, 2016 to July 31, 2017 timeframe. Depending on each analysis, we indicate whether manuscript were subject to internal or external review.

Manuscript Flow
During the period August 2016-July 2017, the teams received and processed 255 submitted manuscripts. Of the 255 submissions, 184 were original submission manuscripts and 71 were revised and resubmitted manuscripts. We rendered a decision on 225 of the 255 manuscripts. In addition, of the 255 manuscripts, 143 were sent out for external review which also received a decision during this time frame (including both original submissions, and revise & resubmits). There were also 28 manuscripts that were submitted in June/July 2016 that still awaited an editorial decision, and therefore are included in the total number of manuscripts that were processed during the 2016-2017 period. At the end of the reporting period, there were 26 remaining manuscripts under review which had yet to receive a decision.

When we declined to review a manuscript, the manuscript in question generally did not fit the journal’s scope. These manuscripts almost always lacked a focus on international political economy or international conflict, and most frequently dealt with political philosophy, sociology, comparative politics, single historical cases, or contemporary or foreign policy concerns. Manuscripts that did not fit the scope of International Interactions were referred to other ISA journals when appropriate. The number of submissions inappropriate to the scope of the journal was 21% (53 of 253 total manuscripts decided during the annual period). This figure represents a small increase of 3.16% (from 17.79%) from the previous period, but is generally in line with historical trends.

Of original manuscripts submitted during our time frame (n=184), 47.8% came from the United States, a slight decline from the 51.9% of last year. 52.2% of new manuscript submissions during our time frame thus came from outside the United States. Of the total number of manuscripts submitted during our time frame (n=255) 56.1% were from the
United States, and 43.9% were from outside the United States. When considering the manuscripts submitted from outside the United States, 21 came from authors at institutions in Asia, 54 in Europe, 20 in the Middle East, 0 in Africa, 8 in North America/Non-United States (all Canada), 5 in South America and 4 Australia/Oceania. Of manuscripts accepted during our reporting period, 65.63% came from the United States (notably down from 81.39% in the previous year), while 34.38% came from outside the United States. The overall acceptance rate for manuscripts submitted from within the United States was 25.32% (down from 43.21% last year), while the overall acceptance rate for manuscripts submitted from outside the United States was 11.36%. We will continue to work to publish quality manuscripts from across the globe. We publish the journal’s scope and instructions for authors on ISA’s website and the ScholarOne website, in addition to its inclusion within each hard copy issue of the journal. Furthermore, as noted by the previous annual report, authors must choose the topic of their manuscript as international conflict, international political economy, or both during the submission process.

Table 1: Manuscripts Reviewed by Month of Submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Month</th>
<th># Manuscripts Reviewed</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 168 manuscripts, of the total handled, which were both reviewed and received a decision during the reporting period. This includes 159 sent for review during the annual period, in addition to 9 manuscripts still under review from the previous year. Of the 168 total manuscripts reviewed, 129 were original manuscripts and 39 were revised and resubmitted.

We first examine only the new manuscripts received and reviewed during the current reporting period. Of that total (n=129), the editors declined to publish 69.78% (n=90) of them. Another 29.46% (38/129) of these new manuscripts received a revise and resubmit invitation. 1 manuscript, as part of a special issue, received an acceptance without
We also received a number of revised and resubmitted manuscripts (n=39). 6 of these manuscripts were rejected after their second round of external reviews. Of the remaining manuscripts, 31 received a conditional acceptance invitation subject only to internal review, and 2 more received an additional revise and resubmit invitation.

Response Time
During the period from August 2016-July 2017, the editorial team coordinated reviews on 168 manuscripts (39 of which were revised resubmissions). This figure excludes manuscripts that did not fit the journal’s scope and were therefore rejected without review. The average response time for editorial decisions for all manuscripts which underwent external review (from the date of an author’s submission to the issuance of an editorial decision) was 48.2 calendar days; the median response time was 48.8 calendar days. For all manuscripts (externally reviewed and declined without review, but excluding internally reviewed manuscripts at the conditionally accepted stage), the mean response time was 38 and the median 39 calendar days. Last year, these figures were 36 and 39, respectively. In 2015, these figures were 32 and 35 days. In 2014, the previous editorial team reported 37 days and 36 days respectively. In 2013, the previous editorial team reported 41 days and 40 days respectively. In 2012, these figures were 46 days and 47 days, in 2011 they were 44 and 41 days, and in 2010 they were 49 and 44 days. Therefore, while the turnaround time increased slightly from the previous year, it appears consistent with recent levels (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Days from Submission to Decision (excluding internal review)](image-url)
As shown in Figure 2, the average turnaround time fluctuated throughout the year and the manuscript with the longest response time was decided at 103 calendar days. Figure 2 is based on the same data restrictions set for Figure 1 (excluding internally reviewed manuscripts with conditional acceptance).

**Figure 2: Mean Response Time by Decision Month**

![Graph showing mean response time by decision month.](image)

**Reviewer Declines (and Response Time)**

Reviewers’ willingness to assess manuscripts has the largest direct impact on the journal’s response time. In order to capture this relationship, we collected detailed statistics on the number of review requests we send for each manuscript, the number of reviewers who pledge to submit an assessment, and the number of reviews that we actually receive. Our standard practice is to request three reviews per new manuscript. Nevertheless, not every manuscript required three reviews in order to make a decision. If
we receive two recommendations that suggest that we reject the manuscript and the reviews are thorough and convincing, we render a decision without a third review. In such cases, the third reviewer is notified that their assessment need not be submitted.

As reviewers either fail to respond to repeated contacts or notify us that they are unable to assist us, we send additional requests. Once three reviewers have agreed to assist us, we do not solicit more reviews. In each request, we ask reviewers to strive to submit their review to us within three weeks of the date that they agree to provide an assessment. Thus, our response time depends critically on the length of time it takes our team to secure three reviewer commitments and the reviews to be returned.

During the reporting period, we requested an average of 5.52 reviewers for every new manuscript. On average, 2.68 reviewers accepted our invitation and promised an assessment, and we received 2.18 submitted reviews per manuscript. In other words, we had to make over two requests, on average, for every review that we received. The maximum number of requests sent for a single manuscript was 16. Finally, the minimum number of days a reviewer took to return a review was 0. Although the maximum number of days to get a review back from the reviewer was 75, most reviewers submit their review within a timely manner, and near our deadline.

Figure 3 shows the historical comparison of reviewer invitation and response rates from the 2011 period to present. While we see that the number of review requests sent per manuscript has declined from the previous period (from 5.87), it remains higher in comparison with previous years.
Table 2: Data on Reviewers, August 2016-July 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Accepted Invitation</th>
<th>Review Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Manuscripts</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Manuscripts</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised and Resubmitted</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Women Reviewers**

In 2010, the International Studies Association asked II to pilot a program in which we collect data on reviewers by gender. We have continued to institute a gender field in ScholarOne that users of the site are asked to complete when they first log-into their account. Despite this, however, very few reviewers do log-in to their accounts. To make it as easy as possible for our reviewers, we have continued to provide them with a direct link to their review submission page (that bypasses the log-in); this is standard practice with most journals. Changes to this policy would impose additional burdens on reviewers and might make them less willing to review manuscripts. The result is that reviewers do not need to provide information on gender, and indeed, very few of them have this information currently in their account. To obtain the data below, the editorial team conducted web searches for each reviewer that we contacted to provide an
assessment for manuscript submissions that went through external review during the current reporting period. This includes a total of 168 manuscripts. Of these original manuscripts, 806 requests were sent to reviewers.

We sent 33.87% of requests (n=273) to female reviewers, which is a decrease from the 35.32% reported during the last period (2015-2016). 51.28% (n=140) of invited female reviewers accepted the invitations to review, and most of them submitted a review after accepting the invitation (79.29%, n=111). During our last reporting period these numbers were 43.16% and 90.24%, respectively. These statistics lead us to two conclusions. First, female reviewers behave similarly to male reviewers; that is, regardless of gender, we must send an average of about 2 requests for every review that we receive. Additionally, the 79.29% review completion rate for female compares with a completion rate of 86.02% for male reviewers, indicating they are similar in this regard. There is no obvious baseline on which to judge whether the journal is being representative with respect to gender and reviewer requests. However, as the next section makes clear, our author pool over this reporting period was comprised of 22.66% percent women, which notably smaller than our 33.87% percent figure for reviewer requests.

We also sent 66.13% of requests (n=533) to male reviewers. Slightly over half of those accepted the invitations to review, at 52.25% (n=279). Almost all actually submitted a review after accepting the invitation (86.02%, n=240).

**Women Authors**

Women, co-authorships teams comprised of all women, and mixed gender teams of authors frequently submit manuscripts to *International Interactions*. Of the 129 new manuscripts submitted to the journal during the reporting period and which underwent external review, there were 203 total authors. 22.66% (n=46) were female authors, and 77.34% (n=157) were male authors. The percentage of authors that were women is marginally higher than last year (2015-2016), when women comprised 22.2% of total authors. However, this is still an upward trend since 2011-2012 when women represented as little as 13.1% of total authors.

The breakdown of decisions provided to these authors is divided between reject, and revise and resubmit. The raw data are presented in Table 3. Each row presents a gender category for authors, while each column shows action taken on the manuscripts submitted by that category of authors. The percentages listed are for the row (i.e., the percentage of manuscripts submitted by the row on which the action listed in the column was taken).
Table 3: Outcomes for Authors of New Manuscripts that Underwent External Review, by Gender (row percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>R&amp;R</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>112 (71%)</td>
<td>45 (29%)</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34 (74%)</td>
<td>12 (27%)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male authors were rejected 71.34% of the time (112/157) and granted the opportunity to revise and resubmit 28.66% of the time (45/157), for new manuscripts that were submitted during our time period and underwent external review. Female authors were rejected 73.91% of the time (34/46) (compared with 52.27% rejection rate in the previous year), and granted the opportunity to revise and resubmit 26.09% of the time (12/46), for new manuscripts that were submitted during our time period and that underwent external review.

As the above statistics demonstrate, women authors receive a slightly larger percentage of rejections than male authors receive, and also receive a lower percentage of opportunities to revise and resubmit. The statistics we report reflect decisions made during the reporting period. A number of manuscripts that received revise and resubmit invitations have not yet been resubmitted to us. Thus, the difference between the acceptance rates of authorships may result from the speed with which authors turn around revisions. Because we generally accept most manuscripts that receive a revise and resubmit invitation (eventually) and the invitations we extend to authors are similar regardless of author gender, we expect that the eventual acceptance rates of authorships comprised of all female authors and all male authorships will converge in the aggregate. In any case, current differences are substantively small.

Global Representation
Overall, 56.1% of all manuscript submissions during our time frame came from within the United States (or contained at least one author at a US institution), while 43.9% came from authors residing outside the United States. In comparison, 60.1% of manuscript submissions during the last reporting period came from within the United States and 39.9% came from authors at institutions that were located outside the United States.

During the current reporting period, *International Interactions* received Non-US
manuscripts from authors in Asia (n=21), Europe (n=54), North America (non-United States, though in this case is only Canada) (n=8), the Middle East (n=20), Africa (n=0) South America (n=5), and Australia/Oceania (n=4).

Table 4 reports the regional distribution of total Non-US manuscript submissions during the annual reporting period, and compares this distribution with the previous year. The previous year saw a notable increase in the number of non-US submissions (35.3% to 39.9%), and this year has seen a comparable increase to 43.9%. This shows an increasing trend towards more non-US submissions and is the highest level at least since 2013. Notable declines in submissions are observed from Asia (from 27 to 21) and Africa (from 4 to 0), though this was offset by increases from the Middle East (13 to 20), Europe (50 to 54) and South America (2 to 5). Submissions from Australia were steady at 4 (though as a percentage is an increase of 1%), and North American submissions (Canada for this year) declined to 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2015-2016 year</th>
<th>2016-2017 year</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Am (non-us)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.America</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the original manuscripts submitted during our time period (n=184), 96 (52.2%) were from outside of the United States. 49.44% of original submissions (n=44) by non-United States authors did not fit the scope of the journal and were rejected without review. The remaining 50.56% of submitted manuscripts went through the review process. Compared with the previous period, this indicates an increase in the number of rejections without review for non-US authors (42.05% to 49.44%). 76 original manuscripts were submitted during our time period from within the United States. In the case of United States authors, 89.47% (n=68) of submitted manuscripts were within the journal’s scope and went through the review process (the remaining 10.53% did not, n=8). These figures illustrate that non-United States authors more often submit manuscripts that do not fit the publication scope of the journal. The difference between US and Non-US authors widened this year (to 38.91%), with non-US desk reject rates comparable to the previous high of 2014 (about 50% of submissions). As with previous years, we are not able to fully
account for this differential. In ongoing efforts to reduce this differential, we continue to provide authors with access to the journal’s scope (and instructions) through numerous online outlets (e.g., ISA website, publisher’s website, and the ScholarOne website), in addition to publishing such information within each issue of *International Interactions*.

Of the manuscripts submitted by non-United States authors which received decisions during the annual reporting period, 88.17% were rejected, while only 11.83% were accepted\(^4\). In contrast, the editors declined to publish 76.14% of manuscripts submitted by United States authors (a notable increase from 56.79% in 2016), while 23.86% were accepted.

These figures suggest that US authors receive a higher number of acceptances than to authors from outside the US, although the difference has closed considerably. We are unable to completely explain the divergence of successful publication rates across regions, we do note the small number of submissions coming from these regions. Ideally, we would like to see greater submission rates from those residing outside the United States and/or Europe. As those rates increase, the publication rates should change as well. How to solicit suitable manuscripts from those regions, however, remains a challenge.

**Subject Matter Diversity**

The scope of *International Interactions* spans two subfields: international conflict and political economy. From the outset of our tenure, we noticed that submissions dealing with international conflict seemed to outnumber those related to political economy. Consequently, we decided to track data on the submitted manuscripts’ subject matter.

For submissions received during the reporting period, 54.55% of new manuscripts that go through the review process involve international conflict topics, while 29.55% involve international political economy (IPE) topics. The remaining 15.91% include components of both areas. These figures indicate that, compared with the previous year, conflict submissions are down roughly 3%, but this difference is accounted for entirely by the increase in the “both” category. The volume of IPE submissions is different by only 0.1%. Figure 4 displays the yearly trend for these categories from the 2011-2012 reporting period to present.

\(^4\) This is of manuscripts with clear decisions, excluding those currently undergoing the review process.
Figure 4: Subject of New Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>IPE</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>58.62</td>
<td>25.52</td>
<td>15.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>56.59</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>61.83</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>52.53</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>17.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>57.46</td>
<td>29.85</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>29.55</td>
<td>15.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time from “Acceptance” until Online Publication
Examining manuscripts which were accepted during the annual reporting period (n=32), 27 days is the average number of days until the manuscript appears online. There are two outliers, however, with values greater than 100 days (December) which appear to skew the mean. The median, at 17 days, thus arguably provides a better measure of central tendency. Figure 5 provides a clearer estimate of how the “time until online publication” has been changing over the course of the reporting period. Using the decision month as an averaging period, it shows a much more stable trend compared with the previous year (which showed a very high beginning rate of over 100 days, but strongly declining over the year).

---

January and July have no values since there were no “Accept” decisions issued during these months.
Future Initiatives

Over the next year, the editorial team anticipates a number of exciting developments:

- The journal will hold a meeting of its editorial board at the 2018 ISA convention in San Francisco, California. This report and other pertinent matters will be the subjects of discussion.
- On August 15, 2017 the Journal will move its headquarters in the US to the University of Pittsburgh as co-editor Michael Colaresi will be moving there to a new position. Christian Gineste and Junghyun Lim will be the new editorial assistants. In addition, Mario Krauser will be the new editorial assistant in Konstanz starting at the end of September 2017.
- A new team will be taking over II starting January 1, 2019.
- We will work with the new team beginning this year to ensure a smooth transition and to organize special issues moving forward.
- All of the currently scheduled issues are on time.
Appendix A: Recent and Upcoming Issues

43(4)

Original Articles
● “When do States Say Uncle? Network Dependence and Sanction Compliance” by Cassy Dorff and Shahryar Minhas
● “Political Context and the Consequences of Naming and Shaming for Human Rights” by Jacqueline Demeritt and Justin Esarey
● “The Dynamics of Enlargement in International Organizations” by Julia Gray, Rene Lindstaedt, and Jonathan Slapin
● “Empty Promises and Non-Incorporation in Mercosur” by Christian Arnold
● “International Recognition and Religion: A Quantitative Analysis of Kosovo’s Contested Status” by Nikola Mirilovic and David Siroky
● “Endogenizing Labor Mobility: A Partisan Politics Explanation” by Qiang Zhou
● “Generalized Social Trust and International Dispute Settlement” by Florian Justwan and Sarah Fisher

43(5)

Original Articles
● “Generalized Social Trust and International Dispute Settlement” by Florian Justwan and Sarah Fisher
● “Economic Interests and Threat Assessment in the U.S. Congress, 1890–1914” by Michael Flynn and Ben Fordham
● “The Chicken or the Egg?: A Coevolutionary Approach to Disputed Issues and Militarized Conflict” by Shawna Metzger
● “Re-Evaluating Peacekeeping Effectiveness: Does Gender Neutrality Inhibit Progress?” by Sabrina Karim
● “Conflict Dynamics and Feedbacks: Explaining Change in Violence against Civilians within Conflicts” by Clionadh Raleigh and Hyun Jin Choi

Research Note
● “Methodological Change and Bias in Economic Sanction Reconsidered” by Peter Bergeijk and Muhammad Siddiquee

43(6)

Original Articles
• “Tariffs and Carbon Emissions” by Daniel Kono
• “Learning and the Precision of International Investment Agreements” by Mark Manger and Clint Peinhardt
• “Democratization in Conflict Research: How Conceptualization affects Operationalization and Testing Outcomes” by Michael Bernhard, Omer Orsun, and Resat Bayer
• “State Capacity, Regime Type, and Sustaining the Peace After Civil War” by David T. Mason and Michael Greig
• “Built-in Safeguards and the Implementation of Civil War Peace Accords” by Madhay Joshi, SungYong Lee, and Roger Mac Ginty

Research Notes
• “Measuring military effectiveness: Calculating casualty loss-exchange ratios for multilateral interstate wars, 1816-1990” by Kathryn Cochran and Stephen Long

44(1)

Original Articles
• “Coup-proofing and Military Inefficiencies: An Experiment” by Andrew Bausch
• “Electoral Reforms and Peace Duration Following Negotiated Settlements” by Eric Keels
• “Signaling Resolve: Leaders, Reputations, and the Importance of Early Interactions” by Danielle Lupton
• “Alliance Proximity and Effectiveness of Extended Deterrence” by Daehee Bak
• “Refugees, State Capacity, and Host State Repression” by Thorin Wright and Shweta Moorthy

Research Notes
• “Wars of Succession” by Scott Wolford
• “Militarism and Dual-Conflict Capacity” by Matthew Wilson and Carla Martinez Machain

44(2)

Original Articles
• “Capital Account Liberalization, Financial Structure, and Access to Credit in Latin America” by Daniel Yoo
“Economic Competitiveness and Social Policy in Open Economies” by Yesola Kweon
“The Politics of Preferential Trade Liberalization in Authoritarian Countries” by Leonardo Baccini and Wilfred Chow
“Worker Influence on Capital Account Policy: Inflow Liberalization and Outflow Restrictions” by Amy Pond
“Leader Language and Survival Strategies” by Leah Windsor, Nia Dowell, Alistair Windsor, and John Kaltner
“When Killers Become Victims: Diversionary War, Human Rights, and Strategic Target Selection” by Efe Tokdemir and Brendan Mark
“What Kinds of Trade Liberalization Agreements Do People in Developing Countries Want?” by Gabrielle Spilker, Thomas Bernauer, and Victor Umaña

44(3)
Original Articles

“The War Will Come to Your Street’: Explaining Geographic Variation in Terrorism by Rebel Groups” by Konstantin Ash
“Coalition Quality and Multinational Conflict Outcomes” by Elizabeth Menninga and Skyler Cranmer
“Which Grievances Make People Support Violence against the State? Survey Evidence from the Niger Delta” by Carlo Koos
“Targets and Tactics: Testing For A Duality Within Al-Qaeda’s Network” by Shawn Ramirez and Arianna Robbins
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