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Overview

This was the second full reporting year for the current editorial team. This was the first year the journal was published by Oxford University Press. Some of the articles published in Volume 17 were accepted by the previous editors and some by the current editors. And, some of the articles were produced by Wiley.

A description of the articles appearing in Volume 17 appeared in 17(1) as an editorial. The first issue of Volume 17 featured papers on policy analysis, the second issue was devoted to teaching and pedagogy, the third issue featured policy analysis and trends in the discipline, and the fourth was devoted to methodological concerns with a forum on replication and two papers on qualitative inquiry. The tables of content of these issues are included at the end of this report.

In the upcoming Volume 18, the first issue will feature articles on policy analysis and trends in the discipline under the heading “Peace Matters.” The second issue is on pedagogy and teaching. The third issue features articles of interest to the discipline, and the fourth issue will present articles on policy analysis under the heading of “The Opposite of Peace.”

In terms of articles in the production cue, we have enough articles published online in advance access or in production to fill almost five issues (through the first issue of Volume 19, 2018).

Impact Factor Increase

The Impact Factor score for ISP increased from 2014 to 2015. In 2014, the score was 0.652, in 2015 the score was 0.914. In terms of rankings, ISP ranked 47th in 86 IR journals in 2014, and 34th in 86 IR journals in 2015. This is a substantial improvement.

Manuscripts Submitted and Decisions

There were 139 manuscripts submitted from November 5, 2015 through November 4, 2016. This is a decrease of five from the previous annual report. Although this number is down slightly and we would have preferred it to have increased, we believe the quality of papers sent out for review has increased.

The editors and editorial board members made active efforts to encourage the submission of papers from different conferences held this past year. Additionally, the editorial office sent over 200 emails encouraging paper presenters from the 2015 ISA meeting to consider submitting their papers to ISP. We will continue our outreach to authors. Clearly, the number of submissions is too low.

Three of the 139 submitted manuscripts were considered “commentary” and were not sent out for review. These consisted of the editorials for 17(1) and 18(1), and a commentary for 18(1) written by
Imad Mansour. The editors encouraged the editorial board to write or find authors for 1,000 word commentaries to run in each issue. The Mansour commentary on the Global South is the only one received to date.

The editors continue to read and confer on every submission making a first “cut” for appropriateness and readiness. Appropriateness is self-defining, but it's worth noting here that the papers we soft-rejected fell into four broad categories. First, we received a remarkable number of foreign policy articles. We sent out foreign policy articles for review when they focused on some issue of interest to the discipline or had a strong policy (as opposed to foreign policy analysis) focus. Second, we received a number of papers from graduate students that appeared to be literature reviews from dissertations or theses. We didn't just reject these out of hand, but all submissions must fall into one (or more) of the four categories of articles published in ISP, and most of these literature reviews did not. Third, we received a number of papers based on original empirical research, but not in any of our four areas of interest. Fourth, we received a number of simulations. As discussed in the 2015 Editorial Board meeting, we are discouraging papers that simply describe a single-time administered simulation. The soft-rejected simulation papers could be described as such. Additionally, many of these simulation papers were not particularly scholarly.

Table 1 shows the decisions in this period compared to the last period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision*</th>
<th>Nov. 5, 2015-Nov. 4, 2016**</th>
<th>Nov. 5, 2014-Nov. 4, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total submissions 136</td>
<td>Total submissions 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Reject, Inappropriate</td>
<td>68 (50%)</td>
<td>71 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>22 (16%)</td>
<td>28 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Revision (First Round)</td>
<td>19 (14%)</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Revision (First Round)</td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>13 (10%)</td>
<td>22 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The data here reflect final decisions (accept, reject) for this period, and first round decisions (major or minor revision)

**2 manuscripts from this period were pending at the time this report was compiled.

ISP was more selective in this period based on the acceptance rate, but more papers were also given revision verdicts (major or minor) and fewer papers were rejected in the first review round. This suggests that the first screening of papers for appropriateness and readiness was effective. Approximately 16% of rejected papers were rejected in the second round of reviews after revision. All of the accepted papers were accepted in the second round of reviews after revision.

**Turn-Around Statistics**

The turn-around statistics for this reporting period compared to the last are generally the same until we get to the number of days from submission to first decision and the number of days from submission to final decision. These numbers are higher in this reporting period, probably indicative of the fact that more manuscripts were given revision verdicts than in the last period and thus spent more time in review. The number of days also reflects longer turn-around time by authors. Manuscript Central is programmed to allow six months for revisions. This year we had a number of authors who requested more time, which would have pushed the average up. In general, though, two months to the first decision is very good, as is three months from submission to final decision.
Table 2 presents the turn-around statistics for this reporting period compared to the last.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Turn-Around in Number of Days</th>
<th>Nov. 5, 2015-Nov. 4, 2016 Present Year</th>
<th>Nov. 5, 2014-Nov. 4, 2015 Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original submissions</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign Reviewer</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign Reviewer</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission to First Decision</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission to Final Decision</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geographical Diversity of Submitting Authors**

The geographical diversity of submitting authors is based on the location of their contact addresses. In the previous reporting year, ISP received submissions from scholars in 27 countries. In this reporting period, ISP received submissions from scholars in 33 countries. Of these, most manuscripts came from the United States (55), followed by the United Kingdom (15), Brazil (8), Australia (7), China (4), Turkey (4), and three each for Germany, India, Israel, Netherlands, Sweden and Ukraine. Two submissions came from each of these countries: Finland, Iran, Ireland, Korea, Norway, Poland, Slovakia. Single submissions came from Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Colombia, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Greece, Italy, Japan, Qatar, Saint Lucia, South Africa, Spain and Taiwan.

**Geographical Diversity of All Authors of Accepted Manuscripts**

There were 21 authors on the 13 accepted manuscripts in this reporting period. Of these, 9 authors were based in the United States, 3 in the United Kingdom, 2 in Germany, and 1 each in Australia, Brazil, Finland, India, Ireland, Japan, and Netherlands.

**Geographical Diversity of Published Authors, Volume 17**

Twenty-nine articles appeared in the four issues of Volume 17 (published in this reporting period). There were a total of 48 authors on these articles. Half – 24 – were from the United States, 7 were from the United Kingdom, 6 were from Germany, 4 from Denmark, 3 Israel, and 1 each from Canada, Estonia, the Republic of Korea, and Norway.
**Gender Diversity of Submitting Authors**

There were a total of 187 authors in this reporting period. Of these 113 (60%) were male, 74 (40%) were female. This is an improvement in balance from the last period when 67% of authors were male and 31% were female.

Table 3 presents the gender breakdown (as percentages) of all submitting authors by decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Revision</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Revision</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Reject</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender Diversity of All Authors of Accepted Manuscripts**

There were 21 authors on the 13 accepted manuscripts in this reporting period. 11 (52%) of which were female, 10 (48%) of which were male. By comparison, 70% of the rejected authors in this period were male, and 30% were female.

**Gender Diversity of Published Authors, Volume 17**

Of the 29 articles published in Volume 17, 16 (33%) were authored by females, 32 (67%) were authored by males.

**Reviewer Statistics**

A total of 237 reviewers were invited in this reporting period. Of these, 130 (55%) agreed to do the review. Of the reviewers who agreed, 89% completed a review, 11% did not. The average time to complete a review was 29.22 days.

In terms of the gender diversity of the 237 invited reviewers, 54% were male, and 46% were female. Of the reviewers who agreed, 51% were male, 49% were female.

In terms of geographical diversity, we asked reviewers from 26 countries, and got agreements to review from scholars in 22 countries. The numbers still were skewed heavily in favor of the United States with 71 reviewers, followed by the United Kingdom with 20. We had five reviewers each from Australia and Canada, four reviewers from Brazil and Netherlands, three from Denmark, and two each from Fiji, Germany, and Singapore. Finally, we had single reviewers from Cyprus, Finland, India, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Serbia, South Africa, Taiwan, and Turkey.
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