This report was prepared by Michael Colaresi and Gerald Schneider, II’s Editors in Chief. The report was submitted on January 3, 2019 for the 2019 Governing Council meeting in Toronto.

FULL REPORT

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS IN CHIEF
Michael Colaresi
Gerald Schneider

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
Margit Bussmann
Ursula Daxecker
Ben Fordham
Burcu Savun

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS
Christian Gineste
Mario Krauser
Junghyun Lim

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The University of Pittsburgh and University of Konstanz editorial team present this report for International Interactions. This report discusses stewardship of the journal from August 1, 2017 to July 31, 2018. During this reporting period:

- The editorial teams handled 274 (210+34 DR + 30 from Last Year) manuscripts.\(^1\) Of these, 194 were original submission manuscripts (70%), while 80 were revised and resubmitted manuscripts. 210 manuscripts, of the total number of handled manuscripts, were received from August 1, 2017 through July 31, 2018, and they represent the manuscript flow during that time period. By July 31, 2018, we rendered a decision on 238 of these manuscripts, with 35 remaining manuscripts which were still awaiting decision at the end of the reporting period. The handling of 274 manuscripts from 2017-2018 shows a decrease in volume from the 283 manuscripts handled by the editorial team in the 2016-2017 year. Of the 283 manuscripts in the 2016-2017 year, 202 were original submission manuscripts (about

\(^1\) 274 can include multiple decisions made over time on the same manuscript. For example, ”Major Revision,” “Conditional Accept,” “Accept.
71%), while 81 were revised and resubmitted manuscripts, showing that the composition of original manuscripts decreased compared to the previous year. This could be explained by the impending change in editorial teams.

- Of the total number of handled manuscripts which received a decision during the annual reporting window, 199 manuscripts were sent for external review. 168 manuscripts were original submissions, while the rest (n= 31) were revised manuscripts. As for the original submissions, the editors issued a rejection for 75.6% (127/168) and issued revised and resubmit invitations for 24.4% (41/168). The editors eventually accepted 58.6% of all externally reviewed submissions during this period (after revised and resubmitted manuscripts are factored in). Overall, 26.6% of the total number of handled manuscripts (n=73) was accepted during the period (n=274), 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 47 calendar days; our median response time was 43 calendar days. Our shortest response time was 1 day – for manuscripts declined without review. Our longest response time was 134 calendar days.

- For each new manuscript, we sent an average of 4.99 review requests. We received an average of 2.4 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 11. 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 98. We sent 37.9% 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, 31.4% were females. The remaining 68.6% of authors of original manuscripts that were reviewed were males. Women authors were rejected 58.5% of the time after review, while 38.5% received an invite to revise and resubmit. In contrast, males were rejected 65.4% of the time after review, and offered an opportunity to revise and resubmit 33.9% of the time.

- The average number of days from the time a manuscript is formally accepted for publication until it appears online is 37 days, with a median of 35 days. This compares with a mean of 53 days from the previous year, showing a notable decline in the time it takes for the publisher to unveil the accepted manuscripts online.

---

1 In other words, this does not multiple count the same manuscript through the review process.
2 The following percentages are based on all authors, not just first authors
Journal Statistics, August 2017 – July 2018

The data that follow are from manuscripts handled by the University of Pittsburgh and University of Konstanz editorial team during the reporting period from August 1, 2017 to July 31, 2018. Submission data includes all manuscripts received by July 31, 2018. 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, 2018. Most figures refer to manuscripts that were submitted from August 1, 2017 to July 31, 2018, however, when necessary, we also report figures referring to manuscripts that were decided within the August 1, 2017 to July 31, 2018 timeframe. Depending on each analysis, we indicate whether manuscripts were subject to internal or external review.

Manuscript Flow

During the period August 2017-July 2018, the teams received and processed 244 submitted manuscripts, not including the 30 manuscripts that were carried over from the previous reporting period. Of the 244 submissions during this reporting period, 175 were original submission manuscripts and 69 were revised and resubmitted manuscripts. We rendered a decision on 169 of the 244 manuscripts. In addition, of the 244 manuscripts, 204 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 26 manuscripts that were submitted in June/July 2018 that still awaited an editorial decision, and therefore are included in the total number of manuscripts that were processed during the 2017-2018 period.

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/unsound to the scope of the journal was 16.4% (40 of 244 total manuscripts decided during the annual period). This figure represents a noticeable decrease from 21% in the previous reporting period.

Of original manuscripts submitted during our time frame (n=175), 59.4% came from the United States, an increase from the 56.1% of last year. 40.6% 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=244) 59.8% were from the United States, and 40.2% were from outside the United States. When considering the manuscripts submitted from outside the United States, 20 came from authors at institutions in Asia, 57 in Europe, 5 in the Middle East, 2 in Africa, 6 in North America/Non-United States (all Canada), 2 in South America and 6 Australia/Oceania. Of manuscripts accepted during our reporting period, 61.64% came from the United States (similar to 65.63% in the previous year), while 38.36% came from outside the United States. The overall acceptance rate for manuscripts submitted from within and from outside the United States was 26.6%. 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>Number of Manuscripts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 199 manuscripts, of the total handled, which were both reviewed and received a decision during the reporting period. This includes 169 sent for review during the annual period, in addition to 30 manuscripts still under review from the previous year. Of the 199 total manuscripts reviewed, 168 were original manuscripts and 31 were revised and resubmitted.

We first examine only the new manuscripts received and reviewed during the current reporting period. Of that total (n=169), the editors declined to publish 43.7% (n=74) of them. Another 56.2% (95/169) of these new manuscripts received a revise and resubmit invitation. 1 manuscript, as part of a special issue, was withdrawn.

We also received a number of revised and resubmitted manuscripts (n=31). 1 of these manuscripts was rejected after their second round of external reviews. Of the remaining manuscripts, 27 received a conditional acceptance invitation subject only to internal review, and 1 more received an additional revise and resubmit invitation.

**Response Time**

During the period from August 2017-July 2018, the editorial team coordinated reviews on 199 manuscripts (70 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 47 calendar days; the median response time was 43 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 16 and the median 22 calendar days. Last year, these figures were 38 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). During this reporting period, two new editorial assistants were trained simultaneously, which led in part to the increase.
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).
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 4.99 reviewers for every new manuscript. On average, 2.40 reviewers accepted our invitation and promised an assessment, and we received 2.19 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 11. Finally, the minimum number of days a reviewer took to return a review was 1. Although the maximum number of days to get a review back from the reviewer was 134, 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. We see that the number of review requests sent per manuscript has declined from the previous period (from 5.52).

![Figure 3: Reviewer Responses](image-url)
Table 2: Data on Reviewers, August 2017 – July 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Invited</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;R</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Female 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. It is important to point out that this is actually a field asking about biological sex. We will use the term gender here for comparison with previous reports. However, very few reviewers ever 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 172 manuscripts. Of these original manuscripts, 858 requests were sent to reviewers.

We sent 37.87% of requests (n=325) to female reviewers, which is an increase from the 33.87% reported during the last period (2016-2017). 43.4% (n=141) of invited female reviewers accepted the invitations to review, and most of them submitted a review after accepting the invitation (92.2%, n=130). During our last reporting period these numbers were 51.28% and 79.29%, 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 92.2% review completion rate for female compares with a completion rate of 88.8% for male reviewers, indicating that the rate for female reviewers is slightly higher. 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 38.57% percent women, which slightly larger than our 37.87% percent figure for reviewer requests.

We also sent 62.12% of requests (n=533) to male reviewers. Slightly over half of those accepted the invitations to review, at 51.03% (n=272). Almost all actually submitted a review after accepting the invitation (88.81%, n=246).
Women Authors

Women, co-authorships teams comprised of all women, and mixed gender teams of authors frequently submit manuscripts to *International Interactions*. Of the 168 new manuscripts submitted to the journal during the reporting period and which underwent external review, there were 223 total authors. 31.39% (n=70) were female authors, and 68.61% (n=153) were male authors. The percentage of authors that were women is marginally higher than last year (2015-2017), when women comprised 22.2% of total authors. This continues a general 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 (three authors had their manuscript withdrawn, which explains the disparity between the total and the addition of reject, and revise and resubmit). 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>Gender</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Percent Rejected</th>
<th>R&amp;R</th>
<th>Percent R&amp;R</th>
<th>Total (+ withdrawn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>68 (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>152 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>220 (+3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65.35% of male authors were rejected (100/153) and the other 33.98% of the time these male authors were granted the opportunity to revise and resubmit (52/153), for new manuscripts that were submitted during our time period and underwent external review. Female authors were rejected 58.57% of the time (41/70) (compared with 52.27% rejection rate in the previous year), and granted the opportunity to revise and resubmit 38.57% of the time (27/70), for new manuscripts that were submitted during our time period and that underwent external review.

As the above statistics demonstrate, female authors receive a slightly lower percentage of rejections than male authors receive, and also receive a higher 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. One point to consider moving forward is adding additional choices to this

---

4 The inconsistency in the numbers of Rejected and R&R compared to the total for male authors is caused by a manuscript that was withdrawn.
question, as well as denoting clearly whether it is biological sex or gender that should be tracked from ISA’s perspective.

**Global Representation**

Overall, 59.84% 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 40.16% came from authors who all resided outside the United States. In comparison, 56.1% of manuscript submissions during the last reporting period came from within the United States and 43.9% 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=20), Europe (n=57), North America (non-United States, though in this case is only Canada) (n=6), the Middle East (n=5), Africa (n=2) South America (n=2), and Australia/Oceania (n=6)).

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 (39.9% to 43.9%), while this year has seen a decrease to 40.17%. Notable declines in submissions are observed from the Middle East (from 20 to 5), and South America (5 to 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America (non-US)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>North America (non-US)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the original manuscripts submitted during our time period (n=175), 71 (40.57%) were from outside of the United States. 38.03% of original submissions (n=27) by non-United States authors did not fit the scope of the journal and were rejected without review. The remaining 61.97% of submitted manuscripts went through the review process. Compared with the previous period, this indicates a decrease in the number of rejections without review for non-US authors (42.05% to 38.03%). 104 original manuscripts were submitted during our time period from within the United States. In the case of United States authors, 93.27% (n=97) of submitted manuscripts were within the journal’s scope and went through the review process (the remaining 6.73% did not, n=7). 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 35.32%), 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, 87.75% were rejected, while only 12.25% were accepted\(^5\). In contrast, the editors declined to publish 87.67% of manuscripts submitted by United States authors (a notable increase from 56.79% in 2017), while 12.33% 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, 54.85% of new manuscripts that go through the review process involve international conflict topics, while 29.71% involve international political economy (IPE) topics. The remaining 15.42% include components of both areas. These figures indicate that, compared with the previous year, conflict submissions are roughly equal. The volume of IPE submissions is different by only 0.2%. Figure 4 displays the yearly trend for these categories from the 2011-2012 reporting period to present.

\(^5\) This is of manuscripts with clear decisions, excluding those currently undergoing the review process.
Time from “Acceptance” until Online Publication

Examining manuscripts which were accepted during the annual reporting period (n=33), 37 days is the average number of days until the manuscript appears online. The median, at 35 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 period⁶. Using the decision month as an averaging period, it shows a much more stable trend compared with the previous year.

⁶ 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:

− Two new editorial assistants, Leonardo Fernandes and Kelly Morrison, took over at the University of Pittsburgh starting August 15, 2018. They have both been outstanding.
− We have moved to 6 issues a year, and we are now able to publish 1040 pages a year. This is a significant investment in II from Taylor and Francis.
− A new editorial team will take over II January 1, 2019, led by Jeffrey Pickering at Kansas State University. The full team is:
  − Jeff Pickering, Editor in Chief, Kansas State University
  − Ana Carolina Garriga, Editor, University of Essex
  − Theodora-Ismene Gizelis, Editor, University of Essex
  − Carla Martinez Machain, Editor, Kansas State University
  − Burcu Savun, Editor, University of Pittsburgh
  − Mark Souva, Editor, Florida State University
  − Graduate Assistants
    − Noëlie Frix, Kansas State University
    − Leonardo Fernandes, University of Pittsburgh
APPENDIX A: RECENT AND UPCOMING ISSUES

44(4)
Original Articles

• “Accounting for Extra-Dyadic Sources of International Outcomes” by Bas, Muhammet; Orsun, Omer; Schub, Robert
• “Economic Sanctions and the Politics of IMF Lending” by Peksen, Dursun; Woo, Byungwon
• “Secrecy and Self-Interest: When Mediators Act Deceitfully” by RezaeeDaryakenari, Babak; Thies, Cameron
• “Delegating Terror: Principal-Agent Based Decision Making in State Sponsorship of Terrorism” by Berkowitz, Jeremy
• “Introducing the African Relational Pro-Government Militia (PGM) Dataset” by Magid, Yehuda; Schon, Justin
• “Inter-Rebel Alliances in the Shadow of Foreign Sponsors” by Popovic, Milos
• “Attitudes Toward Consent-Based and Non-Consent-Based International Law” in a Regional Power Context by Reynolds, Evangeline; Silva Nunes de Oliveira, Amâncio; Onuki, Janina; Winters, Matthew
• “Electoral Institutions, Trade Disputes, and the Monitoring and Enforcement of International Law” by Betz, Timm

44(5)

• “Who Can Reform the Labor Market? IMF Conditionality, Partisanship and Labor Unions” by Gunaydin, Hakan
• “Following the Party in Time of War? The Implications of Elite Consensus” by Wells, Matthew; Ryan, Timothy
• “Issues and Actors in African Non-State Conflicts: A new Dataset” by von Uexkull, Nina; Pettersson, Therese
• “The Reputational Impact of Investor State Disputes” by Minhas, Shahryar; Remmer, Karen
• “International Conflict, International Security Environment, and Military Coups” by Kim, Nam Kyu
• “Sources of Leader Support and Interstate Rivalry” by Rooney, Bryan
• “Seal the Deal: Bargaining Positions, Institutional Design and the Duration of Preferential Trade Negotiations” by Lechner, Lisa; Wüthrich, Simon

44(6)

• “Deeper Commitment to Human Rights Treaties: Signaling and Investment Risk Perception” by Hong, Mi Hwa; Uzonyi, Gary
• “Mtwara will be the new Dubai’: Dashed expectations, grievances and civil "unrest in Tanzania” by Must, Elise; Rustad, Siri Aas
• “Women’s Participation in Peace Negotiations and the Durability of Peace” by Krause, Jana; Krause, Werner; Braenfors, Pia
• “Ethnicity, Political Survival, and the Exchange of Nationalist Foreign Policy” by Suzuki, Akisato
• “Who is a Terrorist? Ethnicity, Group Affiliation, and Understandings of Political Violence” by D’Orazio, Vito; Salehyan, Idean
• “Age Structure and Political Violence: A Re-Assessment of the ‘Youth Bulge’ Hypothesis” by Weber, Hannes
• “Explaining the Number of Rebel Groups in Civil Wars” by Walter, Barbara

45(1)
• “Explaining the Number of Rebel Groups in Civil Wars” by Walter, Barbara
• “Labor Migration Numbers and Rights: Do They Trade Off or Advance Together?” by Bearce, David and Hart, Andrew
• “Ethnicity, Political Survival, and the Exchange of Nationalist Foreign Policy” by Suzuki, Akisato
• “Age Structure and Political Violence: A Re-Assessment of the ‘Youth Bulge’ Hypothesis” by Weber, Hannes
• “The Psychological Effects of State Socialization: IGO Membership Loss and Respect for Human Rights” by Miller, Gina, Welch, Ryan, and Vonasch, Andrew
• “‘Any Press is Good Press?’: Rebel Political Wings, Media Freedom, and Terrorism in Civil Wars” by Keels, Eric and Kinney, Justin
• “Food, State Power, and Rebellion: The Case of Maize” by Koren, Ore
• “Civil War Mediation and Integration into Global Value Chains” by Chatagnier, Tyson

45(2)
• “Civilian Self-Defense Militias in Civil War” by Estancona, Chelsea, Bird, Lucia, Hinkkainen, Kaisa, and Bapat, Navin
• “The Dollar and the Demand for Protection” by Oatley, Thomas, and Galantucci, Robert
• “Security-Civil Liberties Trade-offs: International Cooperation in Extraordinary Rendition” by Cordell, Rebecca
• “Economics, Security, and Individual-level Preferences for Trade Agreements” by DiGiuseppe, Matthew, and Kleinberg, Katja
• “Colonial legacy and foreign aid: Decomposing the colonial bias” by Heinrich, Tobias, and Chiba, Daina
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