

International Studies Perspectives, Annual Report
November 5, 2014 through November 4, 2015

Laura Neack, Editor-in-Chief

A new editorial team officially took control of *ISP* on January 1, 2015, although full editorial operations were shifted to the new journal team in the fall of 2014 due to some process problems.

The new EIC was required to devote substantial time and effort to correcting course for the journal rather than engaging in the planned back-to-origins (re)branding of *ISP*. Among the problems was a significant backlog of accepted manuscripts, including some that had been accepted in 2013 but did not appear in an issue until late 2015. Many of the backlog articles didn't fit the *ISP* mission statement and would have been rejected for lack of fit by the current editorial team. All of the articles published in 2015 and approximately half of the articles in 2016 were accepted by the previous team. The new EIC devoted time to communicating apologies and assurances to authors and found ways to thematically link articles in order to give some semblance of cohesion and common purpose to the pages of *ISP*.

The biggest inherited problem was the nearly three dozen manuscripts that had been published online in Wiley's First Look without any apparent editing or copyediting. Because the old editorial team stepped away before the end of that term, the current EIC had to proof the final issue of 2014 (November). This was a double-size issue full of simulations. The publisher's production editor advised that the EIC should just review the front pages and not do a full reading. However, a cursory review revealed immediate problems – including differences in how article titles and authors were listed. The EIC then proofed each article closely and found that every article had typos, grammatical mistakes, odd production errors and badly constructed and inconsistently rendered reference lists. Doubts were raised about the editing, copyediting and proofing of these many articles. The EIC negotiated an arrangement with the publisher in which the EIC would reedit all the nearly three dozen articles in question and the publisher would reissue each corrected article online with a disclaimer. This process took substantial time and effort (by the EIC and the publisher), time and effort that might have been devoted to publicizing the sharpened focus of *ISP*. It should be added here that many authors were distressed by the disclaimer used by the publisher, so more time was devoted to explaining what had occurred.

The current *ISP* editorial team has made use of "soft rejections" ("inappropriate") in order to sharpen the focus of the journal (once the backlog is cleared). Submissions are rejected when they do not clearly fit *ISP*'s mandate of pedagogy, informed policy-making and trends in the discipline(s).

As the backlog is cleared, the editors will engage in more outreach to educate potential submitting authors about the *ISP* mission. Outreach will begin in earnest in December 2015 with the goal of increasing geographical and gender diversity on the three pillars of the *ISP* mission.

The statistics discussed below are not presented against data for the previous reporting year. The outgoing editors did not prepare a final annual report. Instead, at the end of 2014, the new EIC and editorial staff reported summary data without commentary to comply with ISA requirements. Unfortunately, the reporting dates and categories are not comparable to what is provided below.

Manuscripts Submitted and Decisions

There were 144 manuscripts submitted from November 5, 2014 through November 4, 2015. This included new submissions and revised submissions. About half (71) of the new submissions were rejected as not appropriate for the journal. Another 28 submissions were rejected after the review process. In total, 69% of submissions were rejected. Twenty-two manuscripts were accepted after the review process for an acceptance rate of 15%.

“Turn-Around” Statistics

The average turn-around time for original submissions was 26.5 days. The average time for assigning reviewers was 6.6 days. The average turn-around on revisions was 20.3 days. The average time for assigning reviewers for revisions was 2.5 days.

The average time from submission to first decision was 44.1 days, while the average time from submission to final decision was 61.6 days.

Geographical Diversity of Submitting Authors

Manuscripts were received from submitting (corresponding) authors residing in 27 countries (based on location of submitting author). Most of the manuscripts were submitted by authors in North America and Europe (14 countries total), followed by Asia (5 countries), and the Middle East (4 countries). Submissions also came from Australia, Brazil, Nigeria and South Africa.

In terms of the most represented countries, the United States was the location of 40% of the submitting authors, followed by the United Kingdom, Germany, Australia, Italy, Korea, Canada, Israel and Sweden.

Gender Diversity of Authors

There were 169 authors on submitted manuscripts; of these, 31% were female and 67% were males. Male authors were 2.6 times more likely than female authors to receive an acceptance, 2.3 times more likely to receive a rejection for lack of fit, twice as likely to receive a decision of major revision, 1.6 times more likely to receive a rejection after review, and 1.25 times more likely to receive a minor revision decision.

Geographical Diversity of Reviewers

Invited reviewers resided in 15 countries (Australia, Canada, China, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Korea, New Zealand, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States). Most reviewers were from the United States (almost half). The geographical breakdown for reviewers who completed reviews followed this pattern.

Gender Diversity of Reviewers

Of the total number of invited reviewers, 40% were female and 58% were male (2% were not reported or determinable). Of the females who were invited to review, 57% agreed to complete a review. Of the invited males, 60% agreed to complete a review.