

TABLE 9 (continued)

	1992-93 Budget		1992-93 Budget		1992-93 Budget
Xerox	1,000	Total General Administrative	258,349	Subtotal Expenses ^h	2,475,285
Telephone, Fax	15,000	Building and Equipment		Pending Obligations	
Office and Computer Supplies	12,650	Taxes	74,000	Annual Leave	7,000
General Administrative	8,025	Repair and Upkeep	10,000	Life Memberships	1,000
General Operating Staff	95,306	Maintenance Contracts	28,000	Total Pending	8,000
Miscellaneous	1,000	Depreciation	58,000	TOTAL EXPENSES	2,483,285
Computer Support		Insurance	12,000	Revenue over Expenses	
Fees	8,000	Utilities	25,000	Expenses over Revenue	(34,310)
Staff	61,118	Building Supplies	7,000	Reserve Fund	55,000
Insurance (Workmans' Comp., Bonding, Travel)	7,000	Custodial Staff	44,520	NET REVENUE	20,690
		Total Building & Equipment	258,520		

^aWohlers and Quest pay fees to APSA for offering insurance and travel services to members and for APSA's assistance in making these services available to members. The CFP (Congressional Fellowship Program) is treated as a grant program.

^bRetained earnings constitute the amount of earnings on APSA's investments (the Trust and Development Fund, our general cash flow reserve, and award funds) that are put directly into APSA's operating budget in accordance with APSA's By-Laws, Council policy, and procedures established by the Trust and Development Committee.

^cNot including publications sponsored by the Departmental Services Program.

^dAdditional expenses related to the operation of organized sections are incorporated in the following other parts of this budget: Annual Meeting, Membership, Business Office, PS, Governance, General Administration.

^eThese expenses do not include the in-kind contributions of the University of Rochester, including overhead, equipment, graduate assistants, and relief-time for the Managing Editor.

^fCOGS (Cost of Goods Sold) is an accounting technique that charges the expense side of the budget for the value of the publications sold in the fiscal year. Unsold publications are listed as inventory and counted as a depreciating asset in our annual audit.

^gNational Humanities Alliance, Consortium of Social Science Associations, American Council of Learned Societies, Social Science Research Council, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Council on Education, International Political Science Association, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Council of Professional Association on Federal Statistics, National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, Coalition for National Science Funding. APSA is a member of, but pays no dues to: SSRC, AAASS, and CNSF.

^hThe following programs have independent funding and budgets, and they are reflected in APSA's annual audit: Kirkpatrick Fund, Congressional Fellowship Program, Ralph Bunche Summer Institute, IBM Poliware, other outside grants (these vary from year to year and fund activities, APSA staff, and administrative expenses). FIPSE-Course Syllabi Collection Project, Pew Charitable Trusts-Bill of Rights Education Collaborative Faculty Workshops, Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission-Japan Workshops, MacArthur-South Africa Workshop, NSF Workshop on Data Analysis, NSF/Argonne National Laboratory-Global Warming Conference.

Report of the Managing Editor of the *American Political Science Review*, 1991-92

G. Bingham Powell, Jr.
University of Rochester

Fiscal year 1991-92 was a time of transitions for the *APSR*. This report is divided into sections corresponding to the three major transitions: to a new managing editor and new editorial staff in Rochester; to a new format and a new press; to a new Book Review editor and editorial staff in Austin.

Transition of Managing Editors

Ohio State to Rochester. Pat Patterson completed six years of outstand-

ing service to the profession as managing editor of the *APSR* at the end of the summer of 1991. After careful discussion about the mechanics of transition, we arranged a several-stage transfer of responsibility from Pat and his staff at Ohio State to the new editorial team in Rochester. The general concept was for Pat and Ohio State to continue editing all the 1991 issues and turn over responsibility to Bing Powell and Rochester for the March 1992 issue.

After the December 1991 issue was filled, in late June 1991, Pat began to send all manuscripts and referee reports that were not obvious rejects, to Rochester for final decision (accept, revise and resubmit, reject). These were manuscripts that would be the basis for the March 1992 and subsequent issues. Ohio State continued through the summer to reject

manuscripts where the referees clearly advised against publication, largely a mechanical task. Ohio State also continued to receive all new manuscripts and assign them to referees through the summer. After about August 15 new manuscripts were sent to Rochester, where the new editorial team was being assembled. Ohio State also continued through the fall semester all the work involving the December 1991 issue, including the copy-editing and handling of galley proofs, page proofs, and blue lines. Michael Lane, who has been copy-editing the *Review* for the past five years at Ohio State, continued as copy editor for the new Rochester team for the 1992 issues.

In general the transition procedure worked very well. I want to express my appreciation to Pat Patterson for arranging a transition that allowed

the Rochester team some gradual exposure to the various phases of the duties of managing editor: manuscript decisions, referee assignments, copy editing, and production. We are also grateful to his associate editor, Christine Harrington, for her advice on innumerable matters of detail.

The Flow of New Manuscripts. The first year of a new managing editor typically sees an increased number of manuscript submissions. Dina Zinnes received 407 manuscripts in her first year, a number that dropped to 380 the following year. Patterson received 545 new manuscripts of all kinds in his first year as managing editor, a number that dropped to 427 in the second year and stayed constant at about that rate through his subsequent five years as managing editor. As shown by Table 1, 1991-92 proved no exception to this rule. In 1991-92 Ohio State (in July and August) and Rochester (from August 15 to June 30) received 480 new manuscripts. This number is up about 10% from 1990-91, consistent with the usual first-year bulge. Over 40 manuscripts were received in the months of September, October, March, April, and June.

As Table 1 also shows, the distribution of manuscripts across fields is roughly consistent with previous years, with the pleasant exception of a notable increase in manuscripts in international relations, up from 9 or 10% in previous years to 14% of the manuscripts submitted in 1991-92. American politics (including political behavior and public policy) saw a slight decline in its usual dominance of manuscripts, from 39% to 34%. In absolute terms these figures reflect a remarkable increase from the previous year in international relations from 39 to 67 manuscripts. Normative theory also saw an increase of some 25 manuscripts, while there were eight fewer manuscripts submitted in American politics. It is hard to know if these are serious trends or statistical fluctuations, but I certainly hope that the international relations community is returning to view the *APSR* as a major publication vehicle.

The Acceptance of Manuscripts. Table 2 shows the distribution across fields in manuscripts accepted for

publication. These include the 53 pieces (articles, notes, and controversies) published in March, June, and September, 1992, and those accepted and tentatively scheduled for publication in December 1992. (The Presidential Address in March is not counted.) As the Ohio State team continued with full responsibility for the 1991 issues, and those decisions were almost entirely completed before June 30, they are not included here. (For obvious reasons, parts of each of the 1992 controversies published in this period had earlier origins, but they involved at least some decision making on the part of the current managing editor.) The distribution of published manuscripts parallels roughly the distribution of manuscripts submitted across the subfields, consistent with previous experience. Fiscal year 1988-89 is also shown for comparison, as it is slightly more typical in terms of the num-

ber of manuscripts than are the 1990-91 figures.

Of course, because of lags in accepting and publishing manuscripts, as well as the fact that a large percentage of published manuscripts go through a "revise and resubmit" stage, the distribution of manuscripts published reflects at least in part the manuscripts submitted in the previous year. For this reason, Table 3, showing acceptance rates across subfields, is always somewhat problematic.

As described in their annual reports, previous managing editors have adopted different approaches to calculating the acceptance rates. None of the approaches is perfect. Each is a fair approximation of true acceptance rates if submission rates in the different fields are fairly steady from year to year. Dina Zinnes seems to have reported the acceptance rates on manuscripts

TABLE 1
Distribution of Manuscripts Submitted to the *APSR* by Field in 1990-91 and 1991-92

Field	1990-91 ^a %	1991-92 %
American Politics and Public Policy	39	34
Comparative Politics	22	20
Normative Political Theory	17	21
International Relations	9	14
Formal Theory	13	10
Total	100	99
Number of Manuscripts	438	479

^aFrom Samuel C. Patterson, John M. Brace and Martha Ellis Crone, "The Impact of the *American Political Science Review*," *PS*, 24 (December 1991), p. 766, Table 1. Manuscripts submitted include both new manuscripts and revise/resubmits. 1991-92 figures include 50 of the latter.

TABLE 2
Distribution of Manuscripts Accepted by the *APSR* by Field in 1988-89, 1990-91 and 1991-92

Field	1988-89 ^a %	1990-91 ^a %	1991-92 ^b %
American Politics and Public Policy	36	42	34
Comparative Politics	20	23	17
Normative Political Theory	18	13	24
International Relations	11	7	13
Formal Theory	15	16	11
Total	100	101	99
Number of Manuscripts	55	31	53

^aFrom Patterson, Bruce and Crone, report published in *PS*, December 1991, p. 766, Table 2. Figures based on decisions made in the given year, not on date of receipt or publication.

^bManuscripts published in the *APSR* in 1991-92 (March-December).

TABLE 3
Publication Acceptance Rates by the APSR by Field
in 1988-89, 1990-91 and 1991-92

Field	1988-89 %	1990-91 %	1991-92 %
American Politics and Public Policy	11	9	15
Comparative Politics	16	10	11
Normative Political Theory	13	7	11
International Relations	12	8	18
Formal Theory	15	12	14
Overall	12	9	13
Number of Decisions	n.a.	n.a.	356

^aFrom Patterson, Bruce and Crone, report published in *PS*, December 1991, p. 766, Table 3. Figures based on decisions in a given year, not on date of receipt or publication.

^bPercentages are acceptances divided by acceptances plus rejections plus revise/resubmit, for manuscripts received from July 1, 1991 to June 30, 1992, as of mid-August, 1992. Pending manuscripts are not included.

received during the year, counting revisions as new manuscripts in that year, in so far as that information was known at the time the annual report was prepared. Because of the delays, there are always unevaluated manuscripts (in the hands of the referees), which are excluded from the calculations. Not all manuscripts accepted in the year are included in such a table, because some of them were submitted in the previous year.

Alternatively, Pat Patterson seems to have used the decision in the year as the basis for calculating the acceptance rates. This approach allows the acceptance rate to include all the acceptance decisions made in the year, but the denominator will overlap with, but not be the same as the manuscripts received, because of lags at both ends.

Because our computerized data base includes only rejections of manuscripts for which we initially assigned the referees, we have had to follow the Zinnes approach. As shown by Table 3, this approach generates an acceptance rate overall of 13% for the manuscripts received and thus far decided in the 1991-92 year. Forty-eight manuscripts have been accepted of the 356 thus far evaluated. At the time this report was prepared, 123 manuscripts remained pending. Patterson's figures for 1988-89 and for 1990-91 are shown for comparison, despite the somewhat different approach to calculation.

Although the small number of manuscripts accepted in a given year

in a given field leads to substantial fluctuations, Table 3 shows that the acceptance rates are roughly similar across the subfields of political science. Comparison of the published manuscripts with those received (comparing Table 1 and Table 2) leads to similar results. These results are consistent with the outcomes reported by previous managing editors. Of course, large fields such as American politics and public policy contain many subfields (e.g., American judicial politics or election studies) that will show even more year-to-year fluctuation in both submissions and acceptances.

The Processing of Manuscripts: Procedure and Performance. We continue to use the same general procedures that have been employed at *APSR* for over 20 years and are used by most of the leading journals in our profession. Manuscripts are sent to referees (usually three) who are familiar with the relevant subfield. The name of the author is not revealed to the referees. The managing editor uses the advice of the referees in deciding whether to accept the manuscript, reject it, or encourage submission of a revised version. As any managing editor will explain, the advice of the referees is the predominant factor in the decisions about manuscripts.

Only a handful of obviously inappropriate manuscripts are rejected without review. The *APSR* managing editors have traditionally taken the position that we should try to give

authors advice on manuscripts, even if we cannot publish them. In 1991-92 only 20 manuscripts (of the 480 received) were rejected without review. In about a third of those cases the manuscripts were returned to the author because of excessive length (over 50 pages), without prejudice against resubmission of a shorter version.

The managing editor's own role is important in selecting referees, in interpreting advice when it is conflicting, and in suggesting possible revisions when the advice is supportive enough to encourage resubmission. I have attempted to work closely with the manuscripts at revise and resubmit and acceptance stages to encourage quality of analysis and standardization of presentation. In a further report, I may discuss some of those efforts. But the key role of referees is beyond dispute.

Recognizing that the advice of the referees is critical, I have made every effort to choose highly competent referees. Selecting three referees for each of about 400 manuscripts received and reviewed in the average year means initially seeking the advice of over 1,200 referees. More are needed to deal with the first-year bulge. Because about one initial referee in eight must be replaced for some reason, another 150 referees or so must be added to the initial set. Obviously, the sheer magnitude of the task is formidable.

The task is made more complex by the need to assemble appropriate panels for each manuscript. It is essential that each referee panel has at least one reader capable of dealing with the most technical and difficult parts of the manuscript and at least one reader closely involved with the subject and the approach being used. (Obviously, there are varying levels of overlap among these categories.) It is also desirable to have at least one reader who, although competent in the area, was not quite so closely involved with the immediate work. Given the diversity of subfields in political science, it is difficult for any individual to have the knowledge to assemble appropriate referee panels for all manuscripts.

Fortunately, the new technologies of FAX and electronic mail have made it possible to seek additional

aid in the process of finding referees. In 1991-92 I introduced a process of consulting with the editorial board about referees, not just in special cases but in a routine fashion on nearly every manuscript. This process required, however, care and dedication from the *APSR* graduate student interns as well as from our exceptionally dedicated and helpful editorial board.

When a manuscript was received, it was logged in and then assigned to a graduate student intern. The intern read the manuscript, and prepared an Editorial Board Referral Sheet that included: brief précis, a list of special questions and comments, and a short list of possible referees. The list of questions/comments typically included information about the technical demands of the manuscript (Greek, statistics, country knowledge, etc.), the unavailability of obvious referees, and other information about the relationship of the manuscript to the field that might not be clear from précis and abstract. After my approval, changes and suggestions, the Editorial Board Referral Sheet and the manuscript's abstract were sent by FAX to an appropriate member of the Editorial Board (occasionally to two members). The editorial board member then responded by FAX, indicating the appropriateness of our proposed referees, making additional suggestions, and offering interpretative advice. The intern suggested referees based on this FAX and referee records and availability. I made my final selection of referees based on all this information. In addition to this direct consultation on specific manuscripts, the editorial board members helped make final decisions

in some difficult cases (even reading some manuscripts whose technical demands exceeded my capacity) and worked with us to develop lists of referees for different subfields. Naturally, on occasion I consulted as well with other professional colleagues, in my department and outside it, for additional advice on referee selection.

While no system can be perfect, as various authors will testify, I think that this new approach resulted in the selection of a wide range of competent referees across all the subfields. In fact, in 1991-92 the Rochester office sent over 1,200 letters seeking advice, to 830 different individuals. (This does not count solicitations from Ohio State for the 68 manuscripts they received in July and August.) As best I can tell from the scattered comments in previous managing editor reports, this may be the largest number of referees consulted in a given year in *APSR* history. As best I can tell from reading the results, we generated an extraordinarily large number of competent analyses and recommendations. I hope that these help us not only to choose the best manuscripts, but to give helpful advice to the vast majority of manuscripts that we could not accept. Many of the latter (about 50% according to a study done by Patterson) are eventually published in another scholarly forum. I must express my appreciation to the many scholars who participated in the "Seminar by Mail" (to use Patterson's term) in 1991-92.

However, these new procedures were time consuming to develop and sustain. In conjunction with our general inexperience, staff illness, and the other transitions discussed below,

the consequence was the one part of our first year record of which I am not proud: the manuscript processing time. As shown in Table 4, the average turn-around time on manuscripts was over two weeks longer than the average in Patterson's first two years and about a month longer than the average for Patterson's last four years. The average turn-around time was about 72 working days (calendar days multiplied by 5/7's for comparability to Patterson's figures), in comparison to Patterson's 59 days in 1985-86 and 51 days in 1990-91. Our numbers are roughly similar to the figures reported by Dina Zinnes in her first year (71 days, using the 5/7 multiplier).

The subtotals reported in Table 4 in comparison to Patterson are of some interest. It is obvious that manuscripts spent much too long in our *APSR* office. (The 26-day figure does drop substantially by the end of the year, indicating that some learning took place.) Once the manuscripts went out, the time in the hands of referees was quite good, nearly comparable to Patterson's recent years and better than the initial years when he, like us, had less experience with nagging slow referees and replacing others. Perhaps too optimistically, I interpret the reasonably good referee response times as reflecting our selection of referees who usually felt competent to evaluate the manuscripts they received. (I hope the times continue and even improve.)

Steps to Improve Turn-around Time. The long time the average manuscript spent in our office was the product, I think, of five factors: (1) inexperience (e.g., developing sys-

TABLE 4
Elapsed Time in the *APSR* Review Process (Work Days)

Processing Stage	1981-82	1982-83	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92
From receipt to referee assignment	—	—	4	7	11	12	11	9	26
From assignment to last review	—	—	53	47	35	37	39	42	44
From last review to decision	—	—	2	4	5	8	6	6	9
From receipt to final decision	71	64	59	58	49	52	52	51	72

Note: 1981-82 and 1982-83 are the first two years of the Zinnes editorship. Data from Dina A. Zinnes, "Report of the Managing Editor of the *American Political Science Review*," *PS*, 16 (Fall, 1983), p. 811. 1985-91 are the Patterson editorship; data from Patterson, Bruce and Crone, Table 4, p. 768. Data from Zinnes and Powell are converted to working days (absolute calendar days are multiplied by 5/7), for consistency with Patterson. Because of manuscripts that are not sent out for review, the average total time from receipt to final decision for all manuscripts (based on 226 manuscripts in 1991-92) is somewhat less than the sum of the three preceding stages.

tematic procedures for monitoring the progress of manuscripts within the office); (2) innovative procedures (it took a while to discover what questions to ask the editorial board members and to use FAX, rather than telephone or electronic mail, to communicate with them); (3) too few *APSR* interns, especially during a two-month period when one of them was incapacitated by serious illness; (4) inadequate referee lists in some areas; and (5) editorial board delays. The first two were inevitable and have been largely, I hope, overcome. We have taken steps to alleviate the others by adding a third intern to the *APSR* staff for 1992-93, working with the editorial board to develop referee lists in areas of greatest need, and adding several additional members to the editorial board.

I hope that 1992-93 will see a marked improvement in average time of manuscript processing. I think that the high quality of referee selection encouraged by the editorial board consultation is worth a week's additional time, which is compensated, at least in part, by the faster referee responses. But minimizing the turn-around time, especially for rejected manuscripts, has to be an important challenge for every *APSR* managing editor.

Transition in Format and Press

Format Change: A Larger Size Review. For the readership of the *APSR* the most obvious transition was to the new, larger format of the journal. The change to the 8½" by 11" size was initially proposed by the APSA staff and was supported in a recommendation from the APSA's publications committee. The new size saves substantially on paper costs, as trimming and wastage are no longer necessary. The savings have been used in part to contain costs, especially those posed by rising paper prices, and in part to support an expansion of the size of the *Review*. The increase in size of about 10% has thus far been used to deal with backlogged book reviews; the eventual plan is to increase the size of the Book Review by about 10%, with probably a smaller increase in the size of the article section. The larger paper size makes it easier to

print readable equations, figures, and tables. For all these reasons the change to the new format has been desirable, despite the sadness that I and other admirers of the *Review's* traditional distinctive size and format felt at seeing the demise of the latter.

The larger size required some design changes. I am grateful to Sheilah Mann of APSA and Electronic Type for their work in developing these. For the most part, however, we tried to stay close to the excellent format developed by Pat Patterson and earlier managing editors.

The change to a larger size of paper was also accompanied by a change in the paper itself. I did not recognize that a change in the nature of the paper was also required by the increasing paper costs. A press error in selecting the paper for the first issue, using a glossy instead of the stipulated flat finish, created a first issue that was difficult for many subscribers to read. The finish error was corrected in June, but we continue to search for a paper whose weight, whiteness, and quality will best combine readability and cost containment.

Other than the paper problem, the transition to the larger size paper has gone relatively smoothly. We continue to learn how to exploit fully the additional flexibility created by the larger size pages. But, in general, I think the transition has been successful, if not without pain, with advantages that will be substantial in the long run.

Change in Press. We also changed presses in 1991-92. For a variety of reasons we felt that Byrd Press, which also prints *PS*, could provide us with better technical capacity and attention than had been available. Those expectations have been realized. For example, the time from submitting manuscript copy until the journal appears has been reduced by over a month, enabling more timely appearance of articles and book reviews. It will also be possible, beginning we hope in December 1992, to mail *PS* and the *APSR* together, with a substantial savings in mailing costs.

Inevitably, however, the combination of a new press and a new

editorial team, as well as the new page format, meant that neither could give the other the guidance that would have been desirable in the complexities of transforming manuscript copy into printed journal pages. The March 1992 issue reflected this mutual learning process, especially in the occasionally uneven handling of tables and figures, which are perhaps the most challenging element among our special production problems. However, we believe that most of these "teething troubles" have now been overcome. I want to express here my thanks to *APSR* assistant (now associate) editor Linda Lindenfelser for her tireless efforts in working with Byrd Press in solving the innumerable production issues.

Transition in the Book Review

The Book Review is a large and important part of the *APSR*, and by all accounts is the most widely read section of the *Review*. The task of the Book Review editor is large and important. To receive nearly 2,000 books, choose those appropriate for review, solicit reviewers for them (either individually or as part of several-book reviews) and process the returning manuscripts requires competence, imagination, and dedication. I was extremely glad when Melissa Collie of the University of Texas at Austin agreed to assume these challenging responsibilities.

The transition period for the Book Review began July 1, 1991. Professor Collie assumed full responsibility as Book Review editor on September 1, 1991. Her work in receiving books and assigning reviewers was done entirely autonomously at the University of Texas. Because of the backlog from the previous year, as well as the usual processing time, all of the book reviews and review essays appearing in 1991-92 (September through June) were the work of her predecessor, Helen Ingram of the University of Arizona. The distribution of book reviews by field appearing in the *Review* during that period is shown in Table 5.

The review assignments by Collie in 1991-92 are shown in Table 6. As the table shows, 1,743 books were received by the Book Review in

1991-92, and 468 were selected for review. This number is (by chance) identical to the 468 that appeared in the *APSR* during that time, shown in Table 5, and about the same proportion that has been reviewed in recent years. As the table also shows, the distribution of books reviewed is roughly shaped by the distribution of books received in the various fields.

The results of Collie's review assignments began to appear in the September 1992 issue. We are all fortunate to have the benefit of her excellent work.

Overview Comments

In retrospect it was probably unwise to attempt so many transitions in a single year. Despite ideal cooperation between the managing editors, and strong support from Cathy Rudder, Sheilah Mann, and Robert Hauck at APSA, the sheer complexities of the transition were substantial. The new Rochester team had its hands full learning to manage its inherited procedures, not to mention adding the complex procedures of editorial board interaction. Associate editor Linda Lindenfesler and my first *APSR* interns, David Hayes and Fiona McGillivray, earned their spurs under extraordinarily difficult circumstances and I want to express my apologies, as well as my gratitude, to them.

We were too inexperienced to give the new press all the assistance it could have used in adapting to the special challenges of *APSR*, especially in the areas of graphs and figures. The format change created further complexities and demands for all concerned. In consequence, there were some ragged edges in the appearance and quality of the first few issues. Nor did we foresee adequately the problem of selecting the correct paper. We are also responsible for an undesirable increase of a month in the average turn-around time of manuscript processing. However, having survived the transitions and learned much from them, we are in a stronger position to meet the challenges of the forthcoming year. I think that we are providing authors with good reviews, which I hope will become more timely. Most important, I believe that the *APSR* is publishing the best and most important scholarship in political science.

TABLE 5
APSR Book Review: Report on Books Reviewed, by Field
September 1991–June 1992

Issue	Theory		American		Comparative		IR	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
September 1991	24.8	(25)	32.7	(33)	24.8	(25)	17.8	(18)
December 1991	23.5	(19)	25.9	(21)	34.6	(28)	16.0	(13)
March 1992	24.0	(35)	34.9	(51)	24.0	(35)	17.1	(25)
June 1992	18.6	(26)	31.4	(44)	27.9	(39)	22.1	(31)

Note: Reviews appearing in all these *APSR* issues (September 1991–June 1992) were commissioned exclusively by the Book Review Office at the University of Arizona. N's include books reviewed in review essays and multiple- and single-book reviews.

TABLE 6
APSR Book Review: Report on Books Processed by Field
Summer, 1991 to July 1, 1992

Field	Books Received ^a	Books Reviewed or Scheduled for Review	
		%	(N) ^b
Political Theory	273	30.0	(82)
American Politics	547	29.6	(162)
Comparative Politics	642	21.8	(140)
International Relations	281	29.9	(84)
Average per Field	436	26.9	
Total Number of Books	1,743		468

^aThese are books that have been processed by the Book Review Office at the University of Texas. They were either sent to the UT Office from Arizona or directly from the publishers. Excluded are books that were still being handled by Arizona in the summer and fall of 1991 as well as approximately 130 books that the UT office received too recently to be included in the table.

^bThe N is the number of books for which invitations to receive have been issued. Reviews commissioned by the UT office began to appear in the September 1992 issue of the *APSR*.