

Submission Guidelines for Results Blind Manuscripts**

Criteria for Manuscripts

A results blind manuscript should consist of the following elements:

1. An introduction that summarizes the research question, making clear the audiences to which it is relevant.
2. A literature review that summarizes previous research on the topic and makes very clear what hole or holes in the literature the proposed research will fill.
3. Clearly stated hypotheses and the theoretical basis for them.
4. A detailed description of the proposed research design. Any materials used to generate data should be placed in an appendix. Appropriate descriptive statistics of any observational data already collected should also appear in an appendix.
5. A clear explanation of the link between the theory and the empirics.
6. Explanation of the methods that will be used to analyze the data, including justification of all covariates that will be used.
7. A discussion of any pilot studies that have been conducted.

Submissions that do not clearly meet all these criteria will be desk rejected.

We envision a results blind manuscript to be a completed article with placeholders for tables and anticipated figures.

If the results blind manuscript is conditionally accepted, authors must agree that the final manuscript will be published in *LSQ* if it successfully completes a second round of reviews (see below).

Manuscripts that are conditionally accepted will be given sufficient reasonable time to conduct the proposed research design, but likely no more than six months after conditional acceptance.

If unforeseen circumstances cause the authors to make major deviations to the design and protocol from the pre-accepted manuscript, authors are encouraged to reach out to the editorial office for guidance. Co-Editors will have the right to desk reject the revised version of the project or to send it out for an additional round of reviews.

The Review Process for Results-Blind Manuscripts

Results-blind manuscripts will be subject to at least two rounds of review.

Round 1:

Reviewers will be asked to review the proposed project along five dimensions:

1. Importance of the research question to the field of legislative studies
2. Unassailability of proposed hypotheses and the clarity of the reasoning behind them
3. Soundness and feasibility of proposed design
4. Whether proposed analysis offers an adequate and appropriate test of the hypotheses
5. Whether the proposed data collection efforts and empirical analyses are appropriate and sufficiently detailed

Co-editors may desk reject manuscripts, including results blind manuscripts, if they feel they fail to meet the standards of the journal. Again, as with any other manuscript, after review co-editors conditionally accept the study, ask for revisions, or reject it. Co-editors will set a high bar for results blind manuscripts.

Manuscripts that are conditionally accepted in Round 1 will be subject to a second round of review where, to the extent possible, the original reviewers are re-contacted and asked to assess the manuscript along four dimensions listed below.

Round 2:

Reviewers will be asked to review completed manuscripts along the lines listed below and on any other grounds they deem appropriate:

1. Research question and rationale for hypotheses did not change from the initial manuscript
2. Procedures detailed in the initial manuscript were followed closely and any departures are noted and justified
3. Previously undiscussed, post-hoc analyses are clearly labeled, justified, methodologically sound, and informative
4. Conclusions drawn are justified by the data

Reviewers are free to revisit the dimensions considered in Round 1 if they feel issues that were not clear previously have been revealed in the completed manuscript. Reviewers will be asked not to consider the perceived importance, novelty, or statistical significance of the empirical results.

Completed manuscripts that require anything other than eminently doable revisions will be rejected.

**These guidelines are a modified version of those offered by the *Journal of Experimental Political Science*. *LSQ* will not limit its review of results blind manuscripts to only experimental work.