

From: **bgtravel** bgtravel@uci.edu
Subject: NEW VERSIONS
Date: May 31, 2017 at 4:20 AM
To: Jonathan R. Cervas jcervas@uci.edu

B

I have rewritten both the Appendix and the main text, moving some figures around. I also tried to improve slightly the flow but the changes are pretty minor. And there are unfortunately a couple of new questions for you. You need to take a look at this and then respond to my questions and make changes and then send back to me what I hope will be the last time.

Once more into the breach.

/Bernie

P.S. Sending it as a regular article reduces our chances I am afraid, but you should say in the place where it asks for comments to the editor that

"We had initially hoped to submit this a short note, but with two main contributions, extending the Brams-Kilgour paper from 4 elections to 38 elections and providing a new and simple variable of our own that worked as well or better than their complex combinatoric variables, it was just too hard to cut to the required length, but it is still a very brief article, very close to a research note."

This way if we're on the cusp the editor might give us the benefit of the doubt re judging this as a research note.

On 5/30/2017 11:39 AM, Jonathan R. Cervas wrote:

Okay, can do. Bernie, here are the latest with some of the changes we've been emailing about. One question, if we are going to submit as a full article, is do we want to add back in the text from the appendix?

Jonathan R. Cervas (Twitter: @cervasj)
University of California Irvine
Department of Political Science

On May 30, 2017, at 11:35 AM, Bernie Grofman <bgtravel@uci.edu> wrote:

resubmit as a regular submission.

On 5/30/2017 10:47 AM, Jonathan R. Cervas wrote:

Bernie, I looked up the formatting again, and footnotes indeed need to be double spaced. Our text was only 1.5 spaced, so once I made everything double, even after moving the two tables and taking some text to the footnotes, we are still at 13.5 pages... It will be very hard to cut 3.5 pages, so perhaps we should reconsider our strategy. What are your thoughts on this?

Jonathan R. Cervas (Twitter: @cervasj)
University of California Irvine
Department of Political Science

On May 30, 2017, at 9:07 AM, bgtravel <bgtravel@uci.edu> wrote:

Jonathan, I think both Table 2 and Table 3 needs to go into the appendix with only the correlations reported. Really since these are correlations, not regressions, the tables aren't needed. Cutting them may save a bit on text space as well if we leave the more detailed descriptions of the tables to the Appendix. I would redo Table 1 as a line chart (though fragility and vulnerability are confusing) and include in it two other lines, the actual EC vote share and the proportion of non-competitive states. You might also need to move some of the footnotes into the Appendix. But also they might want the footnotes doublespaced; is that required? And, please remind me about what does and does not count toward the page limit, If this cutting doesn't work we might end up having to submit this as an article.

//Bernie

On 5/30/2017 8:02 AM .Jonathan Robert Cervas wrote:

ON 05/30/2017, JONATHAN ROBERT CERVAS WROTE:

I'm not sure how we are too long, but maybe with the references and tables were over the limit. Two things we could do; one, make a plot of winningness over time and put table one into appendix, or two, more correlations to appendix. I'll think about his more today. It does say in the JOP documentation for authors that the editors prefer visual data opposed to tables.

////////////////////////////////////

Jonathan R. Cervas (*Twitter: cervasj*)
University of California Irvine
Department of Political Science

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Journal of Politics" <em@editorialmanager.com>
Date: May 30, 2017 at 7:33:55 AM PDT
To: "Jonathan Robert Cervas" <jcervas@uci.edu>
Subject: Your Submission Why Non-Competitive States are So Important for Understanding the Outcomes of Competitive Elections: The Electoral College 1868-2016
Reply-To: "Journal of Politics" <jop@virginia.edu>

Ref.: Ms. No.
Why Non-Competitive States are So Important for Understanding the Outcomes of Competitive Elections: The Electoral College 1868-2016
The Journal of Politics

Dear Professor Cervas,

Your manuscript, "Why Non-Competitive States are So Important for Understanding the Outcomes of Competitive Elections: The Electoral College 1868-2016," was flagged during our technical review as having one or more issues that need to be addressed before we can proceed with the review of the manuscript on its merits.

Specifically, the technical check identified the following concerns:

-The manuscript is currently too long. Short articles must be 10 pages or less (double-spaced, 12pt font, 1in. margins).

When you have addressed these issues please go to Editorial Manager at <http://jop.edmgr.com/>, log on as an author and upload the corrected version of your (anonymous) manuscript.

We will begin reviewing your manuscript as soon as the corrected version is received. Please feel free to e-mail us at jop@virginia.edu if you have any questions about your manuscript or the review process.

We look forward to the opportunity to review the corrected manuscript.

Best wishes,

JOP Editorial Team

Bernard Grofman
Jack W. Peltason Endowed Chair of Democracy Studies and
Professor of Political Science
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, CA 92697-5100

Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences
Past President, U.S. Public Choice Society

Bernard Grofman
Jack W. Peltason Endowed Chair of Democracy Studies and
Professor of Political Science
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, CA 92697-5100

Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences
Past President, U.S. Public Choice Society



APPENDIX Why
Non-C...17.docx



Why
nonco...17.docx