Appendix

Table A: *Pi Sigma Alpha Undergraduate Journal of Politics* Manuscript Evaluation Form

#1. Does the author present an original contribution to existing scholarship?
Response options: Yes, no, maybe
#2. Are the main conclusion(s) necessary?
Response options: Scale 1 to 5, 1=Not Important, 5=Highly Important
#3. Are the main conclusion(s) interesting?
Response options: Scale 1 to 5, 1=Not interesting, 5=Highly interesting
#4. Does the author provide convincing evidence to support the main conclusion(s)?
Response options: Scale 1 to 5, 1=Not convincing, 5=very convincing
#5. Are the research methods appropriate for the topic?
Response options: Scale 1 to 5, 1=Not appropriate method, 5=Highly appropriate method
#6. Is the paper written clearly and cleanly?
Response options: Scale 1 to 5, 1=Not clear and clean, 5=Very clear and clean
#7. Is the paper well organized?
Response options: Scale 1 to 5, 1=Not organized, 5=Highly organized

Table B: Peer Reviewers' Manuscript Evaluations by Reviewer Characteristics with the Dummy Semesters Reported

	Additive Evaluation	Original
Semester Year of Journal (control)		
Fall 2014	-4.47**	.453**
	(.686)	(.090)
Spring 2015	-3.93**	.555**
	(.669)	(.087)
Fall 2015	-1.71**	.270**
	(.573)	(.074)
Spring 2016	-1.66**	.235**
	(.592)	(.077)
Fall 2016	-1.09	.251**
	(.604)	(.079)
Spring 2017	-1.45*	.248**
	(.596)	(.078)
Fall 2017	-1.46**	.165*
	(.559)	(.073)
Spring 2018	-1.54**	.023
	(.603)	(.079)
Fall 2018	-3.52**	.259**
	(.625)	(.082)
Spring 2019	-1.27*	-.020
	(.562)	(.073)
Fall 2019	.801	-.160
	(.651)	(.085)
Constant	18.4**	2.13**
	(.934)	(.123)
Adj R-square	0.06	0.06
N	2,122	2,164