

Editor's Report

From January 1, 2010, through December 31, 2010, the Editorial Office received 326 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 326 manuscripts submitted during 2010. About 50% of the manuscripts received a first answer in less than 3 months and 75% of submitted manuscripts received a first answer in less than 4 months.

TABLE 1 – Distribution of Editorial Decision lags between submission and first response to author. January 1, 2010 -- December 31, 2010.

Months	Number of Submissions	% of Submissions
0-3	161	49.4
3-4	86	26.4
4-5	52	16.0
5-6	17	5.2
6-9	9	2.8
9+	1	0.2

Table 2 shows the number of submissions and accepted manuscripts from 2000 to 2010. In the last few years the *Journal* has experienced a significant increase in the number of submissions. Acceptance rates are converging from around 20% to 15%.

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	60	24.8
2005	268	54	20.1
2006	289	58	20.1
2007	295	45	15.3
2008	343	69	20.1
2009	270	36	13.3
2010	326	31	9.5

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Year of Submission	Accepted	Pending	Rejected	Summarily Rejected	Revise & Resubmit	Withdrawn	Total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 (67.1)	27 (9.3)	0	10 (3.5)	289 (100)
2007	45 (15.3)	0	225 (76.3)	17 (5.8)	0	8 (2.7)	295 (100)
2008	69 (20.1)	0	233 (67.9)	34 (9.9)	0	7 (2.1)	343 (100)
2009	36 (13.3)	1 (0.1)	204 (76.6)	22 (8.1)	5 (1.8)	2 (0.1)	270 (100)
2010	31 (9.5)	8 (2.5)	223 (68.4)	47 (14.4)	16 (4.9)	1 (0.3)	326 (100)

Notes: The data are as of July 15, 2011. 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 2005-2010 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, 2006 - 2010.

Subject Category	2006	2007	2008	2009*	2010*
General Economic and Teaching	5	2	3	1	0
History of Economic Thought and Methodology	2	0	1	0	2
Mathematical and Quantitative Methods	9	5	1	7	9
Microeconomics	10	4	9	1	10
Macroeconomics and Monetary Economics	2	3	5	9	3
International Economics	7	4	6	8	6
Financial Economics	2	0	3	2	1
Public Economics	4	2	4	4	7
Health, Education and Welfare	12	3	9	5	6
Labor and Demographic Economics	5	3	8	6	5

Law and Economics	1	2	1	1	1
Industrial Organization	13	4	7	8	6
Business Administration and Business Economics; Marketing; Accounting	0	0	0	0	0
Economic History	0	0	1	0	0
Economic Development, Technological Change, and Growth	3	1	2	7	0
Economic Systems	0	0	0	0	0
Agricultural and Natural Resources Economics	0	0	0	1	2
Urban, Rural and Regional Economics	0	0	0	1	0
Other Topics	0	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. Co-Editors are generally not assigned manuscripts authored by an individual at his or her institution, or by an individual who has a close professional or personal relationship with the Co-Editor. Such papers are handled by the Editor or by a different Co-Editor. Papers submitted by a Co-Editor are generally handled by the Editor. 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. Beginning in January 2010, the Editor and Co-Editors have started systematically exercising the option to return manuscripts to authors without referee review. The decision to return a manuscript without review is based upon several considerations, including expected probability of meeting the standards of the *Journal*, breadth of topic, interest to the SEJ general audience, and other factors.

Editorial Staff

The Editorial Board for calendar year 2010 consisted of Christopher Bollinger (University of Kentucky), Robert Feinberg (American University), Kent Kimbrough (Duke University), John Pepper (University of Virginia), David Ribar (University of North Carolina at Greensboro) and myself. Professor Bollinger ended his term on June 30, 2010 and was replaced by David Ribar. I am very grateful to the Co-Editors 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 600 referees who have spent time and energy during 2010 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*