

entered the referee process in the early summer were particularly subject to this problem, (9 of the 23 manuscripts taking over 6 months for a decision were submitted in July), as are comparative politics manuscripts (8 of the 23). More unusually, an occasional manuscript just receives many cancellations. Although only about one referee in four cancels on average, we have had manuscripts that have taken 11 or 12 referees in order to get three evaluations.

The second problem occurs when we only gradually infer that a referee is not going to respond. By six months the lagging referees have all received reminder postcards, letters, and several telephone calls from the Associate Editor. Frequently, we add another referee. But we don't usually do this when we have spoken to the first referee and he/she promises us that a review will be forthcoming very soon. We tend to believe these promises, which are usually fulfilled. But when they are not, a referee can "string us along" for several additional months with repeated promises before we see the light and replace him or her. This is especially a problem when the referee has been highly recommended for the manuscript because of unusual substantive or methodological expertise that makes him/her difficult to replace.

We continue to work to avoid the problems of excessive time to decision through monitoring, replacement of referees, and even

initially sending to four referees when we have doubts about promptness. Preliminary analysis of our records for the first three years suggests that in 1991–92, 11½% of the manuscripts took longer than 6 months to decide; and that in 1992–93, the figure was 10½%, compared to the 8½% in 1993–94. But these difficulties are very hard to overcome. I do offer my most sincere apologies to those authors who have suffered from them.

### Book Review

I am deeply grateful to Melissa Collie for her fine efforts over the past three years as Book Review Editor. It is a difficult and important job, which she has handled with great skill. Melissa is continuing to edit the Book Review Section through the March 1995 issue of the *APSR*, which goes to press in late September. The incoming Book Review Editor, Mark Lichbach of the University of Colorado, has been receiving, evaluating, and assigning referees for all new books submitted for review since September 1 and will be editing all material to appear in the June 1995 issue. I look forward to working with him.

### References

- Patterson, Samuel C., John M. Bruce, and Martha Ellis Crone. 1991. "The Impact of the *American Political Science Re-*

*view.*" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 24 (4):765–74.

Patterson, Samuel C., Brian D. Ripley, and Barbara Trish. 1988. "The *American Political Science Review*: A Retrospective of Last Year and the Last Eight Decades." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 21 (4):908–25.

Patterson, Samuel C., and Shannon K. Smithey. 1990. "Monitoring Scholarly Journal Publication in Political Science: The Role of the *APSR.*" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 23 (4):647–56.

Zinnes, Dina A. 1983. "Report of the Managing Editor of the *American Political Science Review.*" *PS* 16 (Fall):810–13.

## Errata: 1994–96 APSA Directory of Members

Alexander, Herbert E., Ph.D.,  
Yale University

Beck, Paul Allen, E-mail:  
tsl449@ohstmvsa

Dunn, Charles DeWitt, Arkadelphia,  
AR 71923. Add to geographic index under Arkadelphia, Arkansas.

Herrnson, Paul S., Associate Professor, Phone: 301-405-4123,  
Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Madison

Ravenhill, John, E-mail:  
raven@coombs.anu.edu.au.

Russett, Bruce M., New Haven,  
CT 06520-8301. Phone: 203-432-5233

Sabato, Larry J., Delete from index of minority members under the heading of American Indian.

Watson, Cynthia, E-mail:  
watsonc@ndu.edu