

Hello all,

Thanks for including me (along with David and Rodney) in this exchange of letters; I appreciate being kept informed about this fascinating and important set of conversations. I am writing to add a little information to that which is included in them already.

On forums: The QMMR section is developing a procedure for deliberation over the next few months; the letter below provides a detailed description and invitation to participate. There is also a more informal and less structured invitation for comments and discussion posted on PSNow, under the heading "Updated Invitation for Deliberation about Research Transparency and Interpretability" (it includes a link to the QMMR process and other useful links). As I see it, these are complementary forums -- roughly speaking, one emphasizes breadth and ease of entry, and the other emphasizes depth and more consistent engagement. Let's use both, as well as any other forums that other groups might establish.

On additional information: the "Bing Powell letter," also described below, is now posted on PSNow, under the heading "Letter from distinguished political scientists urging nuanced journal interpretation of JETS policy guidelines." Please note that in addition to the sections quoted by the letter writers below, a key paragraph reads:

We would urge, therefore, that each journal publish a more nuanced statement of the implementation of transparency policies. Some journals have already published such detailed statements or moved in that direction. We applaud this and urge others to follow.

Finally, I note that soon (today, we hope), the APSR editors will post an FAQ about how they plan to implement the JETS principles during the rest of their editorship; this is responsive to the request in, but was developed before, the Powell letter was written and sent. I urge readers of this email to look at all of the questions and answers carefully. Let me note two in particular. The first reiterates a message posted by John Ishiyama on dialogueondart.org on November 17, 2015, in response to concerns expressed by Kristie Monroe (and others) about privacy and confidentiality of interview subjects. This is obviously a key issue, and Ishiyama states,

I think that all of the situations that were described by Kristie can easily be handled under the guidelines If they are expressed in these terms, these can certainly be considered exceptions. . . . (especially if authors explain the reasoning as well as Kristie has). Enough flexibility is built in to deal with these situations.

The FAQs restate this position.

In addition, the APSR's FAQs state that "We will honor IRB or equivalent institutional approvals regarding human subject protections."

More generally, the APSR editors hope that the FAQs will underline their commitment to flexibility in implementing the new guidelines, and especially to publishing the best scholarship representing the rich diversity of political scientists' research. They encourage would-be authors to contact them directly with further questions.

best to all, Jennifer Hochschild