

Philosophical Review Editorial Policies for Authors

The Philosophical Review practices a system of triple-anonymous review. The identity of a manuscript's author is never revealed to referees; nor is the identity of referees ever revealed to authors; and the author's identity is not revealed to editors until after they have reached a final (accept/reject) decision on the manuscript.

Our editorial board is composed of current and some former faculty members of the Sage School of Philosophy at Cornell University, of whom four or five serve as active editors at any point in time. Two editors typically evaluate each submission, though a few manuscripts are rejected after having been read by only one editor, and some submissions are read by as many as four. There are a number of reasons submissions do not pass initial review. The manuscript may be (a) not sufficiently original, or with original material insufficiently developed, (b) not sufficiently grounded in the relevant literature, or (c) too specialized to be of interest to a general readership.

If a manuscript passes the initial editorial review, it is usually sent to an expert referee for further evaluation. Sometimes papers are refereed by other members of the Sage School or by editors themselves; most often, they are refereed by philosophers not at Cornell. To preserve anonymity, we do not distinguish in-house from external referee reports. Some manuscripts are read by only one external referee, but we often use more than one for a given manuscript.

Once reviewed, manuscripts are either rejected without comments, rejected with comments (from editor(s) and/or from an outside referee), conditionally accepted, accepted, or receive a verdict of revise and resubmit. It is very rare for a manuscript to be accepted outright. Most published papers have undergone at least one round of revision, and many have undergone three or four rounds. Editors typically aim to send a resubmitted manuscript to the same referee(s) who originally read the paper, but there are exceptions to this general rule. The original referee(s) may be unavailable, or the editors may decide to have a referee whose expertise is somewhat different read the resubmitted version. If enough time elapses between initial and revised submission, the editors who read the revised manuscript may be different from the editors who read the original submission.

The Philosophical Review now receives more than 600 submissions per year, and publishes about 12. Most submissions that are rejected are rejected without comments. Some papers rejected without comments have been seen by referees who have told us the manuscript does not merit a full report, but most are rejected by editors. We hope authors will understand that we reject many good papers, and that providing comments on all manuscripts is simply

not feasible.

Up-to-date statistics on decisions and time to decision are available [here](#).

These automatically generated statistics do not reflect author gender, because we do not request that information on submission. We do, however, sometimes compile such statistics on the basis of author names and information available on the internet. Statistics from the last five years are below. The numbers in the ‘Submissions’ table exclude resubmissions and papers that were withdrawn or desk-rejected by our editorial manager before they were sent to editors. Most papers published in a year were first submitted before that year. Figures are for lead authors/all authors (with ‘lead author’ referring to corresponding author in the case of submissions, first-listed author in the case of publications); ‘u-nb’ stands for ‘unknown or non-binary’.

Submissions:

year	men lead/all	women lead/all	u-nb lead/all	% women lead/all
2013	460/463	81/81	5/5	14.84/14.75
2014	455/459	54/54	3/3	10.55/10.47
2015	467/501	80/89	3/3	14.54/15.00
2016	480/538	87/95	4/6	15.24/14.87
2017	517/563	106/109	4/9	16.91/16.01

Publications:

year	men lead/all	women lead/all	u-nb lead/all	% women lead/all
2013	9/9	2/2	0/0	18.18/18.18
2014	10/11	0/0	0/0	0/0
2015	9/11	2/2	0/0	18.18/15.38
2016	9/10	3/3	0/0	25.00/23.08
2017	9/11	2/3	0/0	18.18/21.43