

Dear Members of the CPS Editorial Board:

Our recent conversations have been driven by the goals of promoting research transparency in general and signaling that CPS welcomes qualitative research. Many members of the board expressed support for our efforts – but many also raised important questions and concerns, including a possible tension between both objectives. Not surprisingly these echo concerns colleagues across the discipline have expressed about the DA-RT initiative.

We have decided to do two things. First, we have concluded that it is in the journal's best interests to put off posting any new guidelines or suggestions pertaining to data access and research transparency, beyond what we already require (deposit of data and code for all statistical analyses a paper presents). We understand that APSA's QMMR section – as well as others – will be working on these issues over the next year or so, and look forward to hearing from these expert colleagues in the future about best practices.

Second, we have decided to post new “author and reviewer recommendations” that articulate what we regard as central issues in evaluating submissions – of any methodology – to CPS. We do so because many authors (and reviewers) ask us what it takes to get published in CPS, and this list provides a general sense of the qualities that are common to strong papers, whatever the method used. A draft is attached. Our plan is to 1) post these to the CPS submissions page by January 2016 and 2) include these in the email sent to all reviewers. We welcome suggested changes and/or additions or deletions.

Thanks to all who have contributed to this important discussion.

Best,
Ben and David