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Most journals in political science set stringent word or page limits, a fact of which every author is keenly aware. By all reports, researchers expend a good deal of effort trying to work within these limits. This might involve revising successive drafts until the final version fits under the ceiling, moving sections of a paper into on-line appendices, splitting up a subject into “minimal publishing units,” shopping around for a publication venue with less stringent limits, or trying to negotiate special terms with an editor. Some researchers relinquish the goal of journal publication entirely in preference for the more relaxed format of an academic monograph. This option, however, is less and less viable as university presses shorten their lists and reorient their priorities toward books with a popular theme and a potential crossover audience. Some researchers, we must presume, avoid projects that do not seem tractable in a highly concise journal format. In sum, limits on the length of journal articles affect scholarly research in all sorts of ways, some more visible than others.

Our contention is that current policies that impose arbitrary word or page limits on published articles are not serving the discipline well. They contort the academic process in ways that are not conducive to scholarly research or to communication, and they waste everyone’s time.

We begin by surveying the policies of top political science journals. In the second section, we lay out a proposal that we suppose will not be very controversial: journals should clearly state their policies vis-à-vis length requirements and adhere to those policies. In the third section we lay out our more controversial proposal, that journals should abolish — or at least greatly loosen — length limits. The rest of the article elaborates and defends that proposal. We discuss (a) heterogeneity across venues (different journals offering different policies), (b) supplementary material posted on-line (thus avoiding length limits and seeming to solve the problem of the Procrustean bed), (c) references (often the first aspect of an article to be cut down in order to meet a length requirement), (d) the role of length limitations in structuring the work of political science, (e) word limits in economics (where we find journal policies that are much more permissive), (f) the correlation between article length and impact, and (g) the ramifications of a change of journal policies for their business model.

1. Survey

Despite its importance, no comprehensive survey of word/page limits has ever been conducted (to our knowledge). To remedy this omission, and to set the stage for our argument, policies and practices across top journals in political science are summarized in Table 1. Information is drawn directly from journal homepages (instructions to authors) – supplemented, in some cases, by direct communication with editors. (Journal policies are quoted verbatim in Appendix A.)

Comparisons across journals must be inexact inasmuch as they follow different protocols. Some count words and others pages. Some count abstracts, references, tables, figures, and footnotes while others do not (or only count some of them). Some apply limits at the submission stage and others wait for final approval.

Here, we adopt a few standard criteria in order to provide a (more or less) systematic comparison of journal policies based on stated guidelines posted on journal homepages. Length is counted with words, as this is the usual practice in political science and is more exact than pagination. Where limits are counted in pages, we list the journal policy (in pages) and then convert pagination to word counts following journal guidelines with respect to margins and font, as noted in column 2 of Table 1. We also indicate whether length limits include references and appendices (columns 3-4) and whether they are applied at submission (column 5). And we indicate whether, according to the stated policy of the journal, editors are allowed some discretion in applying the rules (column 6).

---

1 Comments and suggestions on various drafts were provided by Taylor Boas, Colin Elman, Alan Jacobs, Carl Henrik Knutsen, and Evan Lieberman.

All of these journals impose space limits, as shown in Table 1.\footnote{3} The tightest limit – 6,500 words (not including references or appendices) – is adopted by *Public Opinion Quarterly.* The most capacious limit – 20,000 words – is allowed by *International Security.* Most hover between 8-12,000 words, with a mean of just over 10,500. All journals except the *Journal of Peace Research* allow editorial discretion in the application of word limits.

The second section of Table 1 focuses on journal practices, i.e., how these length limits are administered. We report mean, minimum, and maximum word counts of all articles published in 2015 (or where unavailable, in 2014), as noted in columns 7-9. Here, we include only regular, full-length articles, as defined by the journal. For example, if a journal has a separate section for research notes, methodology notes, or reviews, these publications are excluded. To determine mean length, we record page lengths for all articles published in a year, calculate the mean (in pages), locate an article with that (approximate) length, place the contents of that article (all aspects of the article – text, abstract, footnotes, references, appendices, tables, figures – so long as it appears in the journal itself rather than in an on-line appendix) into a Word document, and record the number of words. To calculate minimum and maximum length we use page length to identify the articles and then place the contents of those articles (all aspects, as published) into a Word file to record the number of words.

We find that the mean length of articles is close to the stated word limit for most journals (10,638), and there is considerable spread from minimum (7,235) to maximum (15,691). The final section of Table 1 focuses on consistency between policies and practices. Column 10 records the “applicable maximum,” including only those elements of an article that are considered relevant to calculating length according to the journal’s policies. For example, if the journal excludes references from the limit, the applicable maximum does so as well. Column 11 compares the applicable maximum with the official word limit, subtracting one from the other. Results are explored in the following section.

2. Proposal 1: Clarity and Consistency
In comparing policies with practices, we find strong correspondence between the stated limits and the mean length of articles. Comparing columns 1 and 7, only a few journals – notably *International Security* and *Public Opinion Quarterly* – have mean lengths that greatly surpass their official word limits, and this could be partly accounted for by our method of counting, which includes all article content (even that which is not included in a journal’s assessment of word limits).

When comparing maximum (applicable) lengths with stated limits we find considerable divergence, at least for certain journals, as shown in the final column of Table 1. The average difference is nearly 5,000 words. That is, across the twenty top political science journals, the longest article published in a year (usually, 2015) in that journal surpassed these journals’ formal limits by an average of just under 5,000 words. One journal, the *British Journal of Political Science,*


\footnote{3}{We are aware of one influential journal – the newly founded Quarterly Journal of Political Science – which does not impose a length limit, perhaps on the model of economics (see discussion below). This journal did not meet our threshold of a “top” journal according to the chosen sources of journal rankings, however.}
published an article that is more than 11,000 words over the stated limit. And only one journal, the Journal of Peace Research, appears to strictly abide by their word limits (not coincidentally, it is only journal that does not allow editorial discretion).

To be sure, all journals except JPR allow editorial discretion in the application of length limits. In this sense, they are not violating their own policies. However, length limits are described on journal homepages as if they were strictly applied. Authors without experience with a specific journal – or prior correspondence with the editor – would have no way of knowing that they might publish an article of 15,000 words in a journal with a 10,000 word limit.

This inconsistency between de jure and de facto policies is problematic in several respects. Authors are unsure about how to craft their work in order to meet the journal’s guidelines. They do not know whether the word limit will be observed and, if not, how much leeway might be allowed. Likewise, senior faculty, who have greater experience, and perhaps know the editors personally, have an edge, as they can muster inside information to successfully walk this tightrope.

Our first proposal will surprise no one. If wide discretion in word limits is allowed then this policy should be clearly stated on the journal’s homepage. Authors should not be required to second-guess this important issue. Our analysis suggests that most journal word limits in political science should be understood as targets, not ceilings. Note that the mean number of words in published articles aligns closely with journal word limits, with considerable dispersion about the mean. A simple change of terminology would solve this problem. Change word (or page) limit to word (or page) target. And disable web pages (e.g., for the American Political Science Review) that automatically disqualify submissions that violate the target.

While a great deal of effort has gone into enhancing the transparency of journal content (i.e., articles) in recent years, e.g., via the DA*RT initiative, it is equally important that journal policies be transparent. This seems like an easy reform.

3. Proposal 2: No More (Tight) Limits

Our second, more controversial, proposal is that journals should abolish arbitrary, one-size-fits-all word limits, or greatly expand those limits. The argument for this proposal may be concisely stated. An article, like a book or any other written product, should be as long as it needs to be – no longer, and no shorter.

Some articles are over-written. There is only one basic point and it is repeated ad infinitum. Or there is a set of empirical tests that so closely resemble each other as to be redundant; they belong in an appendix or perhaps are entirely unnecessary. Nonetheless, the author feels compelled to fill up the allocated space.

Articles in top natural science journals (e.g., Nature, Science) are typically much shorter than those that appear in social science journals. While we do not think this format generally serves social science well, we should be mindful that some points can be made with brevity, and this should not take away from their importance or their impact. In political science, short papers are usually relegated to “research notes,” simply because of their brevity. As a consequence of this classification, they are not taken very seriously and do not count for very much (re: promotion and tenure). This sort of classification by size seems just as arbitrary as the exclusion of longer papers that surpass word limits.

Some articles are under-written. The author has a very large and complex argument to make, or an extended set of (non-redundant) empirical exercises, many contexts to explore, or many styles of evidence to incorporate. However, under the rigid word limits assigned by the journal, all that appears in the main text is the outlines of a story, from which one can glean little about the truth of the author’s argument.

To clarify, our argument is not for longer journal articles. Our argument is for the removal of arbitrary space-constraints that have nothing to do with the content of a submission. Length should be adapted to the paper under review. Some topics can be dispensed with in 2,000
words. Others may require 20,000, or even 30,000. As such, length should be a minor feature of
the review process, along with other stylistic concerns (not to mention content). Journals do not
mandate that authors present 3 tables and 1 figure. This would be patently absurd. We should
not mandate that they present 10,000 words.

Thus, we are not making an argument for endless babble. Some authors need to be
restrained from diarrhea of the keyboard. Other authors are terse to the point of obscurantism,
and need to be drawn out (“please give a few examples of what you are talking about”). But one
argument about length that does not seem admissible – if we are concerned with such things as
truth and its dissemination – is that an article fit within an arbitrary (short) word limit. Journals
cannot possibly reduce this vital feature of academic research to a formula because articles are
not all alike.

We are reminded of the first question we always get from students after distributing a
writing assignment. How many pages?, they ask. Most students are concerned with the minimal
number of pages they will need to generate in order to pass the assignment. A few are concerned
with the maximum. To both concerns we reply with a set of bounds intended to be advisory –
e.g., “10-20 pages” – followed by the admonition not to get caught up in the number of pages
but rather with the quality of the work they are producing. The number of pages or words you
produce is the least important aspect of your paper, we tell them. Unfortunately, we are not
following this advice in academic publishing.

4. Heterogeneity across Venues

A few journals look favorably upon longer submissions. This includes International Security (20,000
words), Studies in American Political Development (no official limit), and the Quarterly Journal of Political
Science (no official limit). There may be others that we are not aware of. Some journals have even
tighter space restrictions than those listed in Table 1. For example, the newly founded Journal of
Experimental Political Science requests papers of “approximately 2,500 words.”

Evidently, there is some degree of heterogeneity across journals, and this heterogeneity
increases if one examines journals outside the top 20. This heterogeneity may increase over time
– if divergence rather than convergence is the overall trend within the discipline. Authors can
thus shop around for an appropriate forum for their paper – as, to some extent, they do now.
Supply and demand would then intersect. This seems like it might offer a happy resolution of
our problem, with flexibility provided across journals (rather than across articles within the same
journal).

This model of diversity fits the consumer-driven model of the commercial publishing
business. Readers looking for a discursive treatment of a contemporary subject can turn to the
New York Review of Books or the New Yorker. Readers looking for the quick-and-dirty might turn
to a newspaper, a blog, or a publication known for terseness such as the Economist. Fiction
readers may look for long books, short books, or short stories. They are free to choose. By all
accounts, length is an important consideration in consumer choice in the commercial
marketplace.

Likewise, in the world of social science the choice to read a journal article rather than a
book is – at least to some extent – a choice about length. So, one might argue that journal
heterogeneity in length requirements is merely a continuation of a spectrum that stretches from
academic monographs to paragraph-sized blogs, or even Tweets.

Unfortunately, journal specialization by length is inappropriate for academic journals.
The reason, in brief, is that journals do not have overlapping purviews and functions. Because
mass market publications like NYRB, New Yorker, the Economist, and book publishers cater to the
same sort of readers and cover (pretty much) the same sorts of things, readers may choose the
format they wish – short, medium, or long. This does not obviate the tradeoff – conciseness
versus depth – but it means that readers can make choices based on their priorities.
However, journals do not offer multiple options. Indeed, they are in the business of avoiding redundancy. Un-original content is excluded from consideration. Moreover, journals tend to specialize in a particular field or subfield. There is no space in the academic journal market for two journals focused on the same topic – one of which publishes long articles and the other of which publishes short articles.

Only general-interest journals such as the APSR, AJPS, BJPS, and JOP have overlapping purviews. Here, one might envision a division of labor in which some specialize in long articles and others in short articles. This would be productive in all respects except one: differentiation by space allotment would interfere with an important function of top journals – differentiation by quality. Insofar as scholars wish to maintain a clear ranking of journals (and, all protests to the contrary, it seems that they do) space-constraints should not obstruct that goal.

To conclude, heterogeneity across journals does not solve the problem. Indeed, this scenario seems about as defensible as a scenario in which some journals publish authors whose names begin with consonants and others publish authors whose names begin with vowels. Publication decisions should hinge on matters of topicality and quality, not size.

5. On-line Supplementary Material

In recent years, the practice of posting supplementary material on-line has become more common, and readers may wonder if this solves the problem we are posing. Unfortunately, while on-line appendices are surely an improvement over the pre-WWW era, they are not ideal.

Appendices often contain information that is vital to the review process. Sometimes, they appear at the insistence of reviewers or editors. This suggests that anyone seeking to make sense of the argument of a paper would need to access the appendix (and that it should remain in stable form, post-publication). Yet, if the appendix is posted separately those who read or cite an article will feel under no compunction to read it. Such material is not part of the formal record, occupying a nebulous zone. A citation to Sullivan (1998) does not imply “and on-line appendices.” On-line material is sometimes hard to locate and in any case usually ignored. For this reason, on-line appendices sometimes serve as a place to stow away evidence that does not fit neatly with the author’s main argument. Note also that if the on-line appendix is under the author’s control it is susceptible to post-publication manipulation.

For all these reasons it seems essential that appendices be published along with the main text of an article. Moreover, decisions about what material to place within the main text and what to place in appendices should be driven by matters other than arbitrary space constraints. There is nothing sillier than moving text from one place to another simply to get under a 10,000 word limit. (“I put it in the appendix because I ran out of space in the text.”) This sort of shenanigan damages the stylistic coherence of an article, not to mention the time it imposes on the author, editor, and reviewers (who must check up on such things). Note also that when an appendix appears on-line the distinction between main text and appendix is highly consequential – something that editors need to scrutinize closely. By contrast, if an appendix is easily accessible and part of the published version of an article, this decision is not so fundamental.

The same general point applies to other decisions that are often made under pressure from arbitrary word limits, e.g., whether to cite additional work, to address counter-arguments, to provide examples, or to provide clarification of a theory or method. Authors face many decisions about content and composition, and each deserves careful consideration. Writing social science is not a paint-by-numbers exercise. In searching for the right resolution of these questions one consideration that does not seem relevant is an arbitrary word limit. And one must not lose sight of the time required to re-shuffle words and ideas until the proper quantity is obtained. Researcher’s time is valuable and should not be wasted in a trivial quest for magic word counts.
6. References
A few journals such as the Annual Review of Political Science and Public Opinion Quarterly do not include references in their wordcount. But most do (see Table 1). Because references are of little concern to most authors and reviewers (unless it is their work that is being cited, naturally), and because references consume a lot of words (for each citation there is usually a two-line reference), they are usually the first to be sacrificed when an author has to shorten a piece to satisfy a length limitation. For this reason, it is worth pondering the value of references.

Recent work by Patrick Dunleavy (2014; see also Bastow, Dunleavy & Tinkler 2014) suggests that citations to the literature on a subject are essential for providing a basis for evaluation, showing how the present study fits in with an existing body of work. If that body of work is not fully represented, cumulation is impeded. A study must be understood within a context, and that context is provided by the citations. If past findings on a subject are not cited, cumulation is impossible (Gans 1992).

Second, anyone attempting to come to grips with a new area of study must be able to follow a trail of citations in order to piece together who has done what on a given subject. The intellectual history of a subject is located in the citations.

Third, we must consider the problem of academic honesty. We are acutely aware of the problem of plagiarism, when someone’s ideas (uncited) are stolen. A problem that receives less attention – but, arguably, is much more prevalent – is when prior studies of a subject are not cited, or only briefly cited, leaving readers unaware of how novel – or derivative – the author’s theory and findings really are.

Fourth, we might want to consider whether dropped citations are chosen in a biased fashion. Studies suggest that citations are often biased toward prestige journals (Nosek & Bar-Anan 2012: 219) and prestige presses and toward authors who are well-established, senior, male, or at top universities and departments located in the United States and Europe (cites). Commonsense suggests that these biases may be exacerbated in situations where space is in short supply. Here, authors are likely to favor the most prominent writer or work on a subject – the “obligatory” reference.

Finally, we should consider the role of citations in measuring impact. Nowadays, citation counts are critical for the evaluation of scholarship at all levels. Article impact is understood by the number of citations it receives. Journal impact is measured by the number of citations all the articles published in that journal receive. Author impact is measured by the number of citations all their publications receive. And the impact of fields and disciplines is understood according to how many citations they receive. It follows that when articles are incompletely referenced our ability to properly assess impact – of articles, journals, authors, subfields, or disciplines (at-large) – is impaired. We may be able to trace the impact of “obligatory” references, but we cannot trace the impact of other work that may have affected the development of thinking on a subject.

7. Right-sizing the Discipline
The most serious cost imposed by word limits is not the author’s time. Nor is it the published articles that are too long or too short, those that make use of on-line appendices to get around arbitrary word limits, those that omit important citations, or those that are stylistically flawed because the text is playing limbo with the journal’s word count. These are fairly trivial costs. The most serious cost arises from the way in which the word count protocol structures the work of political science.

We shall assume that in our highly professionalized discipline researchers are sensitive to incentives. Since the main incentive is to publish, and since journals are increasingly the most prestigious outlets for publication (surpassing books, at least for most subfields), we must

---

4 We regard these selection factors as elements of potential bias since none of them – with the possible exception of journal ranking – is directly indicative of the quality and relevance of the cited work.
consider what sort of research this regime encourages, and discourages. Substance is inevitably structured by form. And when the form is rigidly fixed the substance must accommodate itself.

Smart academics choose topics and research designs that fit the space-constrained format of the journals they wish to publish in. Since all journals impose word limits, and there is not a great deal of variation in these limits – leaving aside a few journals, as noted above – shopping around does not afford much leeway.

Under the circumstances, success in the business of academic publishing involves finding bite-sized topics that can be dispatched with 8-12,000 words. Qualitative work is at a disadvantage since evidence drawn from archival, ethnographic, or interview-based research normally requires a good deal of verbiage to adequately convey the nuances of the argument, e.g., the many bits and pieces of evidence that, together, contribute to a causal inference. Multi-method work is at an even more severe disadvantage since it must practice two trades – two separate research designs – in order to fulfill its mission. Work that embraces a large theoretical framework, with many empirical implications, is at a disadvantage. Work that applies a theory to multiple contexts is at a disadvantage. Historical work, which often involves both qualitative and quantitative evidence, is at a disadvantage. Research designs that fall far from the experimental ideal, and therefore involve a great deal of supporting argumentation and robustness tests, are at a disadvantage.5

Insofar as scholars are rational they will pause before undertaking such ventures, or will divide them up into separate pieces – “minimal publishing units” – that fit the space-constrained format of journal publication at the cost of redundancy (since the evidence for a large argument is divided up across multiple publications). But our biggest concern should be about articles that never get written, or if written (in a fit of vainglory) never get published.

8. Economics

At this point, it may be appropriate to consider our field in relation to our social science cousins on the “hard” (naturalist) end of the spectrum. In Table 2, we survey the space-limitation policies of top journals in economics.


Table 2 reveals that economics journals have a considerably more relaxed set of policies with respect to article length than political science journals. This is signaled by the calculation of length in pages rather than words, for most journals. Six journals have no official limit on article length. Among the remainder, the average limit is just over 15,000 words. Only one journal, Economic Journal, has a tight limit – in this case, 7,500 words. However, we find that the average length of an article in that journal is well over 12,000 words and one article published in 2015 included over 21,000 words. So this does not constitute much of an exception from the industry norm of overall permissiveness with respect to article length.

As with political science journals, practices often depart from policies. The applicable maximum length is 7,000+ over the stated limit. This suggests that in economics, as in political science, limits are not strictly applied. And this, in turn, suggests a problem of transparency.

---

5 We recognize that experimental research may also involve a good deal of supporting argumentation and robustness tests. But we assume that the burden carried by this sort of theoretical and empirical work is even greater when the data is observational, thus requiring greater space for elaboration and demonstration.

9. Impact

Thus far, the gist of our argument is that by removing an arbitrary component of the publication process – article length – we will improve efficiency (spending less time worrying about limits and strategizing about how to get around them) and also arrive at higher-quality articles. Can the latter proposition be tested?

In one sort of hypothetical experiment, article length would be arbitrarily assigned. Conceivably, one might enlist a journal that takes a relaxed attitude toward word limits. Submissions that surpass a given threshold (e.g., 15,000 words) and pass the review process (in that form) would then be randomized into a control group (no change) and a treatment group (subjected to a word limit of 10,000 words). Compliance (not to mention ethics) would be difficult. Authors would need to comply with the imposed limits (they could withdraw their submission and resubmit to another journal, complain to the editorial board) and reviewers would also need to be brought on board. Results could then be compared by standard metrics of influence such as citations – though some confounding might result as the nature of the experiment became known throughout a discipline and authors posted “full” versions on their web sites.

Natural experiments can also be imagined. For example, one might regard length limits as an instrument for actual length (columns 1 and 7 are indeed highly correlated). Citations counts for articles could then be regressed against the instrumented values for article length. However, this research design cannot disentangle journal fixed effects (some journals are more cited than others, even among the top-twenty list of journals in Table 1).

Even so, we may learn something from the simple expedient of comparing articles – published in the same journal – that are shorter and longer. Because we are interested in relative length within the same journal, it is sufficient to rely on page counts (as listed in citations or on the journal’s table of contents) rather than word counts.

As a measure of scholarly impact we rely on citation counts tallied by Web of Science, transformed by the natural logarithm (to accommodate a right-skewed distribution). To eliminate variations based on year of publication we focus on a single year located in the past (so that the article has time to be digested by the academic community) but not the distant past (since we wish to generalize about contemporary policies and contemporary academic work.) Balancing these goals, we focus on articles published in 2005.

Citations may be influenced by the journal so we can only reliably compare articles published by the same journal. However, a good deal of variation can be found in most economics journals, and in one political science journal, as revealed by the range (minimum/maximum) of actual word counts in Tables 1 and 2. Our analysis therefore focuses on those journals with the greatest range in 2015, provided they were published in 2005 (excluding journals formed after that date). This includes British Journal of Political Science, American Economic Review, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Econometrica, Economic Journal, Journal of Economic Literature, Journal of European Economic Association, Journal of Finance, Journal of Management, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Political Economy, Quarterly Journal of Economics, Review of Economic Studies, Review of Economics and Statistics, Review of Financial Economics, and Review of Financial Studies. (Note that our selection criterion allows us to focus on journals that do not make a fetish of length, and thus follow policies that are closer to those that we advocate.)

The regression analysis takes the following form: \( Y = X + Z + \varepsilon \), where \( Y \) is citation count, \( X \) is article length, \( Z \) is a vector of journal fixed effects, and \( \varepsilon \) is the error term. Estimation is by ordinary least squares with standard errors clustered by journal.

This model, presented in Table 3, suggests that there is a robust relationship between length and citations. Indeed, the relationship appears to exist in every journal in our sample. (When regression analyses are conducted for each journal, seriatim, we find a positive – though not always statistically significant – relationship between length and impact.)
A plot of marginal effects is displayed in Figure 1. We preserve the logged scale of citation count on the $Y$ axis; however, tick marks on the $Y$ axis correspond to real (unlogged) values in order to render the exercise more natural. It is tempting to focus on the – apparently huge – impact of article length on citations as one approaches the right end of the $X$ axis. However, this is not where most of our data falls, as suggested by the wide confidence bounds in Figure 1. The mean number of pages in our sample is about 25, with a standard deviation of about 12, so generalizations near the center of the distribution are apt to be most meaningful.

Consider a hypothetical increase in article length from 25 to 35 (a little less than one standard deviation), which translates into an increase of about 6,000 words. This is associated with a substantial increase in citation count, from (roughly) 35 to 55.

The meaning of this estimate may be debated. Let us assume for a moment that a rational selection bias is at work, namely more important articles are granted greater space in a journal’s pages. Articles deemed less significant are granted less space, as a product of the considered judgments of authors, reviewers, and editors. In this circumstance, it should be no surprise that longer articles garner more attention, as measured by citation counts.

Of course, we cannot rule out the possibility that researchers are influenced by length in their estimation of an article’s importance. Length may be regarded (implicitly) as a proxy for significance, and hence may influence citation counts. Even so, to the extent that such norms exist they reinforce our basic point that, in the considered opinion of the scholarly community, length is correlated with importance.

Now let us consider the extent to which this analysis might be regarded as exemplifying a causal effect. We certainly cannot assume that articles analyzed in this sample would have been better (i.e., more impactful) if they were longer. But it does seem reasonable to propose that the longer articles in our sample would have been worse had they been shortened. Not all articles justify an expansive domain. But those that do would presumably suffer if the domain were arbitrary constrained. In this loose and unidirectional sense, we may regard the estimate contained in Table 3 as causal.

10. Business Costs
We have argued that length limits should be abolished, or at least considerably relaxed, in political science. A consequence of this change in policy is that many articles would increase in length. (A few might decrease, as we have suggested, if quality rather than quantity becomes the principal metric of evaluation.) Assuming that the number of articles published over the course of a year remains the same, the number of words and accompanying features such as tables and figures will grow. This imposes additional costs on academic editors and publishers, whose resources are already stretched thin.

One cost is associated with proofreading and type-setting additional pages. We assume that this cost is fairly minimal. (One can envision a scenario in which long appendices are submitted in “copy-ready” form, as is the case now with on-line material.)

A more substantial cost is associated with printing and mailing the “hard copy” version of the journal. Note that under the current business model most journals are sold to individuals and institutions (primarily university libraries), who receive a paper copy, which may then be bound prior to shelving (yet another cost, though one that libraries must bear). In economics, many journals charge a publication fee, which no doubt helps to support production costs, and may account for the greater latitude granted to authors by journals in that discipline.

However, the hard-copy format seems increasingly anachronistic in an age when most journal output is accessed on-line and when many journals are adopting on-line only publication.

---

7 We derive this word-count estimate by drawing one normal-sized (full-text) page from each journal in our 2005 sample, counting the words on those pages, and calculating the mean across those 16 journals.
formats. If this is the wave of the future there may be good reasons to hasten its arrival. Our proposal presumes that this is possible, and desirable.

11. Conclusions

The expansive policies adopted by many top economics journals dovetails with a move within the field to prize quality over quantity. Economists lay their claim to fame on a small number of high-impact publications rather than a larger number of less-cited ones. H-index scores matter more than the length of a CV. This may have something to do with the not-so-secret desire of every economist: to obtain a Nobel prize by the end of their career.

While no such holy grail exists for political science, it may still be possible to adjust incentives so that the time-consuming search for fundamental discoveries and/or comprehensive analyses of a large topic is facilitated. One small but important step in this direction involves loosening the noose around author's necks so they can focus on the task at hand, rather than the space they must fill.
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<td>4,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Political Science Review</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13,361</td>
<td>10,990</td>
<td>16,593</td>
<td>16,593</td>
<td>4,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review of Political Science</td>
<td>7,800 (24)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8,522</td>
<td>5,799</td>
<td>14,467</td>
<td>12,525</td>
<td>4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Journal of Political Science</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12,048</td>
<td>7,830</td>
<td>23,596</td>
<td>23,596</td>
<td>11,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Political Studies</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11,597</td>
<td>8,320</td>
<td>15,890</td>
<td>15,890</td>
<td>3,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management and Peace Science</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10,239</td>
<td>4,574</td>
<td>13,155</td>
<td>13,155</td>
<td>3,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Political Research</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8,789</td>
<td>5,916</td>
<td>11,039</td>
<td>10,127</td>
<td>2,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Security</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17,123</td>
<td>10,803</td>
<td>20,215</td>
<td>20,215</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Quarterly</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11,934</td>
<td>8,440</td>
<td>15,840</td>
<td>15,840</td>
<td>3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>14,201</td>
<td>14,201</td>
<td>3,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Peace Research</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9,382</td>
<td>7,445</td>
<td>10,417</td>
<td>10,417</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Politics</td>
<td>10,250 (35)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9,948</td>
<td>6,917</td>
<td>17,754</td>
<td>12,720</td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. of Public Admin. Research &amp; Theory**</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11,610</td>
<td>5,298</td>
<td>16,091</td>
<td>15,284</td>
<td>3,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Politics</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8,103</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>14,788</td>
<td>14,788</td>
<td>6,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Analysis</td>
<td>8,750 (30)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8,570</td>
<td>5,766</td>
<td>15,371</td>
<td>14,706</td>
<td>5,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Communication</td>
<td>8,750 (30)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8,684</td>
<td>5,039</td>
<td>15,890</td>
<td>14,654</td>
<td>5,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Geography</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10,821</td>
<td>9,372</td>
<td>14,891</td>
<td>14,891</td>
<td>3,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Psychology</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9,253</td>
<td>7,776</td>
<td>13,014</td>
<td>13,014</td>
<td>4,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion Quarterly</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8,520</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>17,775</td>
<td>15,451</td>
<td>8,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Politics</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13,324</td>
<td>11,282</td>
<td>18,531</td>
<td>18,531</td>
<td>6,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean or Distribution (Yes/No)</td>
<td>10,578</td>
<td>17/3</td>
<td>9/11</td>
<td>15/5</td>
<td>19/1</td>
<td>10,628</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>15,691</td>
<td>15,045</td>
<td>4,467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Political Science Journals**


**Limit** = ceiling on number of words (pages) allowed in research articles, as specified on journal homepage. Where the limit is specified in pages we list the projected word limit based on the specified page limit with double-spaced lines and standard 12-point font. **At submission** = limits apply at submission. **Editor's discretion** = longer versions may be accepted with editor's approval. For further clarification of journal policies see Appendix A. **Practices** = mean, minimum, maximum word counts across all research articles and including all published material (footnotes, references, appendices, et al.). **Applicable maximum** = maximum word count including or excluding references and appendices, as specified by the journal's policies. All journals observed in the calendar year 2015 except those marked with a double asterisk (**), which are observed in 2014.
## Table 2: Economics Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Including References</th>
<th>Including Appendices</th>
<th>At Submission</th>
<th>Editor's Discretion</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Applicable Maximum</th>
<th>Column 10 - Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEJ: Applied Economics</td>
<td>15,750 (50)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12,989</td>
<td>5,581</td>
<td>20,125</td>
<td>17,293</td>
<td>1,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEJ: Economic Policy</td>
<td>15,750 (50)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14,923</td>
<td>8,978</td>
<td>25,318</td>
<td>20,026</td>
<td>4,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEJ: Macroeconomics</td>
<td>15,750 (50)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16,267</td>
<td>8,877</td>
<td>28,263</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>11,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEJ: Microeconomics</td>
<td>15,750 (50)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16,595</td>
<td>5,218</td>
<td>26,791</td>
<td>22,499</td>
<td>6,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Economic Review</td>
<td>15,750 (50)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17,183</td>
<td>8,305</td>
<td>24,099</td>
<td>23,545</td>
<td>7,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review of Economics</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,836</td>
<td>7,897</td>
<td>19,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookings Papers on Economic Activity **</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,084</td>
<td>15,723</td>
<td>21,846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econometrica</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15,998</td>
<td>6,589</td>
<td>25,139</td>
<td>21,042</td>
<td>4,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Journal</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12,697</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>21,894</td>
<td>21,894</td>
<td>14,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Economic Literature</td>
<td>25,000 (100)†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15,492</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>35,347</td>
<td>35,347</td>
<td>10,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Finance</td>
<td>22,000 (60)*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14,834</td>
<td>7,253</td>
<td>23,650</td>
<td>23,650</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management</td>
<td>15,750 (50)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13,178</td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>19,661</td>
<td>19,661</td>
<td>3,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>15,750 (50)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14,247</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>18,718</td>
<td>18,718</td>
<td>2,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Political Economy **</td>
<td>12,000 (40)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17,872</td>
<td>8,649</td>
<td>28,892</td>
<td>28,892</td>
<td>16,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Journal of Economics</td>
<td>15,750 (50)†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15,587</td>
<td>11,403</td>
<td>23,893</td>
<td>23,893</td>
<td>8,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Economic Studies</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,104</td>
<td>8,661</td>
<td>23,514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Economics and Statistics</td>
<td>12,500 (45)†</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13,053</td>
<td>6,753</td>
<td>21,609</td>
<td>20,114</td>
<td>7,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Financial Economics</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,972</td>
<td>7,324</td>
<td>19,787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Financial Studies</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,936</td>
<td>9,218</td>
<td>24,878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean or Distribution (Yes/No)</td>
<td>15,386</td>
<td>14/0</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>10/4</td>
<td>12/2</td>
<td>15,127</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>24,995</td>
<td>23,112</td>
<td>7,255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Journal** = top 20 economics journals by impact (www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php?area=2000). **Limit** = ceiling on number of words (pages) allowed in research articles, as specified on journal homepage. Where the limit is specified in pages we list the projected word count based on the specified page limit (in parentheses) with double-spaced lines or 1.5 spaced lines (*) and standard 12-point font. **At submission** = limits apply at submission. **Editor's discretion** = longer versions may be accepted with editor's approval. For further clarification of journal policies see Appendix B. **Practices** = mean, minimum, maximum word counts across all research articles and including all published material (footnotes, references, appendices, et al.). **Applicable maximum** = maximum word count including or excluding references and appendices, as specified by the journal’s policies. All journals observed in the calendar year 2015 except those marked with a double asterisk (**), which are observed in 2014.
**Table 3: Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length (pages)</strong></td>
<td>0.028***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal fixed effects</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>0.3050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordinary least squares regression of article citations (Web of Science), logged, on article length (pages), including journal fixed effects and clustered standard errors. *p<.10  ** p<.05  ***p<.01  Journals: 0=BJPS, 1=JEEA, 2=JEL, 3=AER, 4=Brookings, 5=Econometrica, 6=Econ J, 7=Finance, 8=Management, 9=Marketing, 10=Pol Econ, 11=QJE, 12=Rw Econ Studies, 13=Rw Econ & Stats, 14=Rw Financial Studies, 15=Rw Financial Econ.
Marginal effect of length (pages) on impact (citations, logged), based on benchmark model in Table 3, with 95% confidence intervals.
Appendix A: Journal Policies in Political Science

In the following sections we excerpt key passages from journal homepages (default) or from direct communication with editors (as noted) in order to provide further clarification of policies with respect to word (or page) limits. All passages are direct quotations. All journals listed in Table 1 are included.

American Journal of Political Science

- Submissions to the *AJPS* should be no longer than 10,000 words. The word count includes the main body of text, notes, references, and the headers of tables and figures. It does not include the title page, Abstract, or Supporting Information. Manuscripts at or near the maximum length will be subjected to special editorial review to determine whether their length is justified. A manuscript that exceeds the 10,000 word limit will be returned without review unless the author specifically requests and justifies an exemption, and the Editor grants the request.

American Political Science Review

- Manuscripts should be no longer than 12,000 words, including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices intended for publication. Font size must be 12 point for all parts of the submission, including notes and references, and all body text (including references) should be double-spaced. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words.

Annual Review of Political Science

- Every Annual Review volume has an assigned length. Likewise, each article has a length assigned by the editors (always indicated in the letter of invitation). Please keep to this length, which includes any figures and tables submitted. You can roughly estimate the printed length of your article with our online length calculator at http://www.annualreviews.org/page/authors/author-instructions/submitting/length.
  - *Email communication:* Authors are given 20 pages per article. If an article is significantly over length, it is returned to the author upon submission for cuts. If it is within 20% of the length allotment, we proceed with publication. For journals like Political Science that don’t have a lot of figures, we expect our manuscripts to be about 7,500 words and 100 references.

British Journal of Political Science

- All Research Articles should in general be between 5,000 and 12,000 words (or equivalent in tables and figures) in length. An abstract not exceeding 120 words is required.

Comparative Political Studies

- Articles should be double-spaced, with 1” margins all around, a 12-point font (Times Roman preferred), and contain a maximum of 12,000 words, including abstract, notes, references, tables and figures. Longer submissions will not be considered. Authors may include further material in an online appendix. Footnotes and bibliographic citations for new submissions should follow the Publication Manual of the
Conflict Management and Peace Science
- The suggested target for articles is about 10,000 words. The text should be clearly organized, with a clear hierarchy of headings and subheadings. Quotations exceeding 40 words should be indented in the text. Texts of a length exceeding 10,000 words will be considered as interest warrants and space permits.

European Journal of Political Research
- Manuscripts should be in English and should not exceed 8,000 words in length. This includes the main text of the manuscript, footnotes, tables, figures and references. Overlength manuscripts will be returned to the authors. Materials in the appendix do not count towards the 8,000 words limit.

International Security
- A length of 10,000 to 15,000 words (including footnotes) is appropriate, but the journal will consider and publish longer manuscripts. Authors of manuscripts with more than 20,000 words should consult the journal's editors before submission.

International Studies Quarterly
- Research articles should not exceed 12,000 words (excluding online-only supplementary information, but including footnotes, endnotes, bibliography, and tables).

Journal of Conflict Resolution
- Submitted papers should be double-spaced throughout, with footnotes, references, tables, and graphs on separate pages, and should follow The Chicago Manual of Style. Total word count, including everything, should be at a minimum about 8,000 and not exceed 11,000 words. Manuscripts should begin with an abstract of no more than 150 words.

Journal of Peace Research
- Regular articles are restricted to an absolute maximum of 10,000 words, including all elements (title page, abstract, notes, references, tables, biographical statement, etc.).

Journal of Politics
- Manuscripts submitted for review at The Journal of Politics should be no longer than 35 pages, including all text, footnotes/endnotes, references, and tables/figures. The title page and abstract do not count against the 35-page limit.
- Authors should double-space all text and appendix materials in a standard 12-point type font, with one-inch margins. Footnotes/endnotes and bibliographic citations should be double-spaced using the same font size as that used in the body of manuscript; all manuscripts need to have a separate references section at the end of the manuscript that is ordered alphabetically. Tables and figures may be single-spaced.

Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory
- Manuscripts should be no longer than 12,000 words, including abstract, tables, and references, in 12-point font and with double spacing. References should be cited in the text as (Author date) and listed alphabetically in the references section. All pages should be numbered. Appendices longer than three pages will be placed online as supplementary material.
Party Politics
• Articles offered for publication must be typed in double spacing throughout, with generous left- and right-hand margins. The word length for articles is 8000 words, including notes and references. An abstract of up to 150 words should precede the main text, accompanied by up to five key words.

Political Analysis
• While Political Analysis will consider longer papers for potential review, authors are reminded that it is generally important to make their work as approachable as possible for readers, and that a shorter, well-focused manuscript will generally be better received by reviewers and readers. Authors are encouraged to submit supplementary materials, if there is need for details that might be relevant for reference but are not essential for understanding the material presented in the paper.

Political Communication
• Normally, manuscripts should not exceed 30 pages of 300 words each, inclusive of notes, references, and illustrations. Please use double line spacing.

Political Geography
• Articles: Full research pieces, max 11,000 words, inclusive.

Political Psychology
• Manuscripts should be double-spaced, using 12-point font. Papers should be no longer than 9,000 words, including appendices and references.

Public Opinion Quarterly
• Article submissions, including Poll Reviews and Research Syntheses, should generally not exceed 6,500 words.

World Politics
• Research articles and review articles may be up to 12,500 words in length, including notes.
Appendix B: Journal Policies in Economics

In the following sections we excerpt key passages from journal homepages (default) or from direct communication with editors (as noted) in order to provide further clarification of policies with respect to word (or page) limits. All passages are direct quotations. All journals listed in Table 2 are included.

American Economic Journal (four journals)

- All manuscripts should be submitted in PDF format with 1.5 line spacing and should not exceed 50 pages. This limit includes reference lists, figures, and tables. Please use 12-point Times New Roman or similar font. Margins should be 1.5 inches on the top, bottom, and sides.

American Economic Review

- All manuscripts should be submitted in PDF format with 1.5 line spacing and should not exceed 50 pages. This limit includes reference lists, figures, and tables. Please use 12-point Times New Roman or similar font. Margins should be 1.5 inches on the top, bottom, and sides.

Econometrica

- Papers should be formatted to be easily readable and should be under 45 pages. Submitted manuscripts should be formatted for paper of standard size with margins of at least 1.25 inch on all sides, 1.5 or double spaced text in 12 point font. Material should be organized to maximize readability, for example footnotes, figures, etc., should not be placed at the end. We strongly encourage authors to submit manuscripts that are under about 45 pages / 17,000 words including everything (except detailed data descriptions and experimental instructions). While we understand some papers must be longer, if a paper (except for data and instructions) is longer than the aforementioned length it may be rejected without review, and if the main body of a manuscript (excluding appendices) is more than the aforementioned length, it typically will be rejected without review.

Economic Journal

- In general, articles should not exceed 7,500 words. Overlong papers will be returned without consideration.

Journal of Economic Literature

- Email communication: We do not have a hard and fast stated page limit, but once a paper gets to be over 100 pages, double spaced, in Word, it seems that is when peer reviewers are likely to start suggesting that the length be whittled down/ or around 60,000 words. We publish full papers in our Articles section, but we also print review essays, which are typically longer and more detailed than regular book reviews and they generally use the book as a sort of “jumping off” point for a broader discussion of the literature. Articles probably average around 80 pages (before typesetting) and review essays average around 20 pages. The estimated average page counts I am discussing do include references, tables, and appendices. Our papers typically include rather long reference lists, since the papers explore the literature on a given topic. On extremely long manuscripts, this is left to editorial discretion and to the discretion of the peer reviewers.
Journal of Management

- Papers that severely violate the spirit of the guidelines (e.g., papers that are single-spaced, papers that use footnotes rather than conventional referencing formats, papers that greatly exceed 50 pages), or which do not clearly fit the mission of the journal will be returned to authors without being reviewed.

Journal of Marketing

- Font: 12 point, Times New Roman. Text [Including references]: Double-spaced, left-justified
  Page Maximum: 50 pages, properly formatted and inclusive of title, abstract, keywords, text, references, tables, figures, and footnotes

Journal of Political Economy

- Email communication: The JPE has an unofficial limit of 40 pages per article, which includes all the materials intended for print publication. (We also publish online-only appendixes, which do not count toward the page allotment.) We have had a fairly relaxed attitude toward this limit, of late. The typical article falls between 30 and 50 pages. Going beyond the limit is solely at the discretion of the editor.

Journal of Finance

- Your manuscript must not exceed 60 pages in length.

Quarterly Journal of Economics

- Email communication:
  1. Does the journal have an “unofficial” or “advisory” page limit? 50.
  2. What is the average length of the articles published in your journal? 50.
  3. If a limit exists, does it include the references, tables, and other appendices? Yes, however we encourage the use of online appendices and other supplemental material.
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