

Decision Letter (CMPS-21-0042.R1)

From: niki.marinov@gmail.com

To: francisco.villamil@uc3m.es

CC:

Subject: Conflict Management and Peace Science - Decision on Manuscript ID CMPS-21-0042.R1

Body: 05-Oct-2021

Dear Dr. Villamil:

I have received 3 reviews of your paper, "Violence, co-optation, and postwar voting in Guatemala," (Manuscript ID CMPS-21-0042.R1), which you submitted for consideration to Conflict Management and Peace Science. The reviewers' comments are included at the bottom of this letter or can be found attached to the letter.

Two of the reviewers are pleased with your work - as am I. I have included an extra reviewer in the pool. This reviewer raises some criticisms. I paste their review below. I believe you can successfully address them in a subsequent revision round and this is why I am granting another RR. I realize this may not have been the outcome you expected, however, in my opinion, your work will benefit from paying close attention to what the included reviewer has to say:

"Violence, co-optation, and postwar voting in Guatemala argues that violence has differing effects on civilians' post-war political preferences, depending upon communities' ability to essentially resist the effects of wartime propaganda. I found the article to be interesting, but thought it could be improved in terms of conceptual clarity and the evidence the author presents. I hope that my comments are useful as the author continues to work on the manuscript. Comments are listed in the order they came up while reading the manuscript.

It is unclear whether the author is focusing on violence or propaganda-while these two things are closely related they are also very different. More clarity on this is needed throughout.

Author states previous work treats relationship between violence and civilian political preferences as a black box - can they expand? What information is missing from previous research?

"Individuals are assumed to objectively interpret violent events, and no attention is paid to

those external factors that might influence this interpretation, such as propaganda or cooptation

efforts by the perpetrator". -- this sentence is key-would put it in the introduction to clarify contribution from the beginning.

"I focus on the case of Guatemala, which is a good example of the use of denying

and cooptation strategies". - does this mean it's unique? How does it compare to other cases?

How does the article relate to research on misinformation? Are there parallels to be drawn from the use of misinformation in political campaigns/where it is most successful?

I'm unclear on how a scorched earth campaign could gain support from the civilian population

With the PAC system-couldn't civilians just go through the motions without actually believing rebels were the enemy? What did the government do to actually convince them?

I still don't understand how the state managed to avoid being blamed for acts of wartime victimization. Need more details in the theory and evidence section on how propaganda could overcome experiences with wartime victimization.

The author needs to differentiate between communities' ability to resist co-optation strategies, and just being ideologically opposed to the government. Isn't it more plausible that these communities were simply ideologically opposed to the government? I understand that these two mechanisms could operate in conjunction with one another but I remain unconvinced that the author's plays a significant role.

Why is there no data on vote share for the FRG in 2011? Why does vote share drop so significantly for both parties over the years?

The author blends together a lot of concepts in their explanation of what determines communities' reaction to propaganda-pre-war political mobilization, literacy, collective story telling, ideological capital-it becomes confusing as to which one is the most important. If the author thinks they are all equally important, that should be laid out from the beginning and in the theory section.

The author should explain why they include the controls that they do-as of right now there is no explanation, just a list of variables.

The paper would benefit from more discussion of the quantitative results-what do they actually mean, what can we conclude from them?

The qualitative section seems ad hoc-what strategy did the author use to find these sources? What sources were reviewed?

Should you decide to revise the manuscript and to resubmit it to us, please include a memo with the revised version. The memo should respond to the points made by the editor and each of the reviewers. Please note the changes that you have made to the manuscript in response to the reviewers' and editor's suggestions. In those instances in which you opt not to follow a recommendation that has been made, please briefly explain why you have chosen not to do so.

We will likely return the revised manuscript – should you provide one – to a proper subset of the current reviewers and may call upon a new reviewer. Should we bring a new reviewer into the process, we will inform her/him of the manuscript's revised status.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/cmpps> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

*** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/cmpps?URL_MASK=a54e3743052644258b5aaeb5efbfe2f9

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

CMPS has committed to implementing the Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT) initiative. Manuscripts must now comply with the following set of instructions (these can also be found under the submission guidelines on CMPS's SAGE website):

Conflict Management and Peace Science supports the Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT) statement and, as such, endorses policies requiring authors to make accessible the empirical foundation and logic of inquiry of evidence-based research. Conflict Management and Peace Science requires authors to delineate clearly the analytic procedures upon which their published claims rely and, where possible, provide access to all relevant analytic materials. If such materials are not published with the article, they should be included with replication materials posted to the journal's website (see below).

For contributions based on quantitative data, Conflict Management and Peace Science requires authors to submit their data set and all other relevant replication materials. The replication materials provided must make it feasible for others to replicate the results for all tables and figures printed in the article and in any online appendices submitted as part of the article. Conflict Management and Peace Science asks authors to use data citation practices that identify a dataset's author(s), title, date, version, and a persistent identifier. In sum, data should be referenced and cited, where possible, as an intellectual product of value.

Authors or manuscripts submitted to Conflict Management and Peace Science are expected to conform to norms regarding the protection of human subjects. Authors of articles submitted for review may be asked by the editor to provide certification of appropriate institutional review. If cited data is restricted (e.g. classified, require confidentiality protections, were obtained under a non-disclosure agreement, or have inherent logistical constraints), authors should notify the editor at the time of submission. The editor shall have full discretion to follow the journal's policy on restricted data, including declining to review the manuscript or granting an exemption or without conditions. The editor shall inform the author of this decision prior to review.

Authors are expected to make their data and replication materials available through the SAGE Conflict Management and Peace Science website. Data will be hosted on the website as a supplementary data file. If your paper is accepted for publication, you will be asked to add a note at the beginning of the manuscript stating that data and replication materials can be accessed via a supplementary data file hosted on SAGE's CMPS website.

When uploading your revised manuscript, please upload your DA-RT materials using the DA-RT Material file designation.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Conflict Management and Peace Science, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Conflict Management and Peace Science and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,
Editor, Conflict Management and Peace Science

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 3

Comments to the Author

I agreed with the other reviewers about the need to address the empirical and theoretical questions in the first draft. The author has taken into consideration all the comments of the reviewers, and I think that the manuscript has improved.

I would like to congratulate the author on a very interesting article.

In summary, I recommend publication of this article.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

This manuscript is substantially improved. I appreciate the author's effort to address each of the reviews seriously and to be very transparent and honest about the paper's findings. I also think the quantitative results are very suggestive, but the inclusion of the qualitative section and use of mixed methods really helps make the argument persuasive and clear. I recommend acceptance. Nice job.

One small note: I did see a noticeable typo on p. 24 in the first sentence of the "Identifying the mechanism" section, where it says that the analyses "hinger" on the road accessibility assumption. Might want to fix that.

Reviewer: 4

Comments to the Author

Violence, co-optation, and postwar voting in Guatemala argues that violence has differing effects on civilians' post-war political preferences, depending upon communities' ability to essentially resist the effects of wartime propaganda. I found the article to be interesting, but thought it could be improved in terms of conceptual clarity and the evidence the author presents. I hope that my comments are useful as the author continues to work on the manuscript. Comments are listed in the order they came up while reading the manuscript.

It is unclear whether the author is focusing on violence or propaganda-while these two things are closely related they are also very different. More clarity on this is needed throughout.

Author states previous work treats relationship between violence and civilian political preferences as a black box - can they expand? What information is missing from previous research?

"Individuals are assumed to objectively interpret violent events, and no attention is paid to

those external factors that might influence this interpretation, such as propaganda or cooptation

efforts by the perpetrator". -- this sentence is key-would put it in the introduction to clarify contribution from the beginning.

"I focus on the case of Guatemala, which is a good example of the use of denying

and cooptation strategies". - does this mean it's unique? How does it compare to other cases?

How does the article relate to research on misinformation? Are there parallels to be drawn from the use of misinformation in political campaigns/where it is most successful?

I'm unclear on how a scorched earth campaign could gain support from the civilian population

With the PAC system-couldn't civilians just go through the motions without actually believing rebels were the enemy? What did the government do to actually convince them?

I still don't understand how the state managed to avoid being blamed for acts of wartime victimization. Need more details in the theory and evidence section on how propaganda could overcome experiences with wartime victimization.

The author needs to differentiate between communities' ability to resist co-optation strategies, and just being ideologically opposed to the government. Isn't it more plausible that these communities were simply ideologically opposed to the government? I understand that these two mechanisms could operate in conjunction with one another but I remain unconvinced that the author's plays a significant role.

Why is there no data on vote share for the FRG in 2011? Why does vote share drop so significantly for both parties over the years?


The author blends together a lot of concepts in their explanation of what determines communities' reaction to propaganda-pre-war political mobilization, literacy, collective story telling, ideological capital-it becomes confusing as to which one is the most important. If the author thinks they are all equally important, that should be laid out from the beginning and in the theory section.

The author should explain why they include the controls that they do-as of right now there is no explanation, just a list of variables.

The paper would benefit from more discussion of the quantitative results-what do they actually mean, what can we conclude from them?

The qualitative section seems ad hoc-what strategy did the author use to find these sources? What sources were reviewed?

Date Sent: 05-Oct-2021

 Close Window

