

Editor's Report

From January 1, 2009, through December 31, 2009, the Editorial Office received 270 new manuscript submissions. Tables 1–4 provide information about the editorial process and the journal for the past year and some previous years.

Table 1 shows the time between submission and the journal's first response, whether to reject, ask for a revision, or accept a manuscript, for the 270 manuscripts submitted during 2009. About 50% of the manuscripts received a first answer in less than 3 months and around 75% of submitted manuscripts received a first answer in less than 4 months. Remarkably no manuscript required more than 9 months for a first answer.

TABLE 1 – Distribution of Editorial Decision lags between submission and first response to author. January 1, 2009 -- December 31, 2009.

| Months | Number of Submissions | % of Submissions |
|--------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 0-3 | 132 | 48.9 |
| 3-4 | 70 | 25.9 |
| 4-5 | 46 | 17.1 |
| 5-6 | 16 | 5.9 |
| 6-9 | 6 | 2.2 |
| 9+ | 0 | 0 |

Table 2 shows the number of submissions and accepted manuscripts from 2000 to 2009. In the last few years the *Journal* has experienced a significant increase in the number of submissions. Acceptance rates are steady, around 20%.

TABLE 2 – Manuscripts submitted and accepted, 2000-2009.

| Year | Submitted | Accepted | % |
|------|-----------|----------|------|
| 2000 | 251 | 57 | 22.7 |
| 2001 | 259 | 51 | 19.7 |
| 2002 | 244 | 50 | 20.5 |
| 2003 | 248 | 60 | 24.2 |
| 2004 | 242 | 59 | 24.8 |
| 2005 | 268 | 47 | 20.1 |
| 2006 | 289 | 39 | 20.1 |
| 2007 | 295 | 45 | 15.2 |
| 2008 | 343 | 67 | 19.5 |
| 2009 | 270 | 29 | 10.7 |

Table 3 shows the status of manuscripts submitted in the last four years as of July 1, 2010, and provides a more accurate account of the editorial process.

TABLE 3 – Status of manuscripts by year of submission, 2006 - 2010.

| Year of Submission | Accepted | Pending | Rejected | Summarily Rejected | Revise & Resubmit | Withdrawn | Total |
|--------------------|--------------|------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------|
| 2006 | 58 (20.1) | 0 | 194 (67.2) | 27 (9.3) | 4 (1.4) | 6 (2.1) | 289 (100) |
| 2007 | 45 (15.2) | 0 | 225 (76.3) | 17 (5.8) | 6 (2.0) | 2 (0.6) | 295 (100) |
| 2008 | 67 (19.5) | 1 (0.3) | 231 (67.4) | 34 (9.9) | 9 (2.6) | 1 (0.3) | 343 (100) |
| 2009 | 29 (10.7) | 2 (0.7) | 204 (75.6) | 22 (8.2) | 11 (4.1) | 2 (0.7) | 270 (100) |

Notes: The data are as of July 1, 2010. Percent are shown in parentheses. Pending manuscripts include submissions and resubmissions still in the hands of the Editorial Office. Revise & Resubmit manuscripts are instead in the hands of the authors. Summarily rejected manuscripts are returned to the authors without consulting with a referee.

Finally, Table 4 shows the distribution of published papers in 2005-2009 by subject, using JEL codes. Considerable fluctuation appears in the number of papers in each category over the five-year period considered, which is acceptable for a general interest journal.

TABLE 4 – Distribution of JEL Subjects for Accepted Manuscripts, 2005 - 2009.

| Subject Category | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009* |
|---|------|------|------|------|-------|
| General Economic and Teaching | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| History of Economic Thought and Methodology | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Mathematical and Quantitative Methods | 2 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 7 |
| Microeconomics | 2 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 1 |
| Macroeconomics and Monetary Economics | 6 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 9 |
| International Economics | 7 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Financial Economics | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Public Economics | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Health, Education and Welfare | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 5 |
| Labor and Demographic Economics | 7 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 6 |
| Law and Economics | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Industrial Organization | 4 | 13 | 4 | 7 | 8 |
| Business Administration and Business Economics; | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marketing; Accounting | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Economic History | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Economic Development, Technological Change, and Growth | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Economic Systems | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural and Natural Resources Economics | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Urban, Rural and Regional Economics | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Other Topics | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*9 papers were experimental papers

Editorial Process

Manuscripts are submitted to the *Journal* using Editorial Express, an Internet-based electronic system run by John Rust and his associates. Once submitted, papers are assigned by the Editor to one of the Co-Editors or to herself for the refereeing process. Papers are assigned on the basis of field of expertise of the Co-Editor, combined with a variety of other considerations, including equalization of work load and conflict-of-interest rules. All responsibility for handling the manuscripts, including the final decision, rests with the Editor to whom the manuscript is originally assigned.

Manuscripts are reviewed using a double-blind process: the name of the author is removed from the paper and not revealed to the reviewers, and the referees' identities are not disclosed to the authors.

Editorial Staff

The Editorial Board for calendar year 2009 consisted of Christopher Bollinger (University of Kentucky), Robert Feinberg (American University), Kent Kimbrough (Duke University), John Pepper (University of Virginia), and myself. The addition of Robert Feinberg to the Editorial Board was motivated by the increased number of submissions realized in recent years. Professor Bollinger ended his term on June 30, 2010 and has been replaced by David Ribar (University of North Carolina at Greensboro). I am very grateful to the Coeditors for their dedication, hard work, and insight. Each has handled a demanding job with alacrity and professionalism. Their collective efforts have made an enormous contribution to this journal and to the economic profession.

The Editors rely heavily on the Board of Associate Editors for advice in the evaluation of manuscripts. On behalf of my fellow Co-Editors, I thank the Associate Editors for their help in our editorial tasks. Finally, we cannot forget the nearly 700 referees who have spent time and energy during 2009 reading and offering valuable comments on the manuscripts received by the *Journal*. My deepest appreciation goes to them.

I also thank Hayley Bialkowski, the *Journal* editorial assistant, for her outstanding job of handling all the different tasks and demands of the *Journal*.

Laura Razzolini, *Editor*