

Table 1: 2007 Journals Survey

2007	AJP	CA₁	CB₂	CJ	CO₃	CP₄	CW₅	GRBS	HEL₆	HESP	HSCP₇	ICS₈	MOUS	Syllecta Classica	TAPPA	TOTALS
# of submissions by women	36	26	3	12	3.33	18.5	16	9	19	10.92	5	1	12	6	14	191.75
# of submissions by men	50	28	13	28	7.66	60.5	24	39	7	21.08	10	17	15	6	33	359.24
# of submissions by unknown gender	0	0	0	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
# of acceptances for women	4	6	2	3	3.33	8	0	7	11	5.26	2	0	8	4	4	67.59
# of acceptances for men	20	4	8	11	9.66	28	9	22	4	11.74	3	11	9	5	7	162.4
# of acceptances for unknown gender	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Acceptance rate for women	11%	23%	67%	25%	100%	43%	0	78%	58%	48%	40%	0	67%	67%	29%	35%
Acceptance rate for men	40%	15%	62%	39%	126%	46%	28%	56%	57%	56%	30%	65%	60%	83%	21%	45%
% total submissions by women	42%	48%	19%	30%	30%	23%	40%	19%	73%	34%	33%	5%	44%	50%	30%	35%
% total submissions by men	58%	52%	81%	70%	70%	75%	60%	81%	27%	62%	67%	95%	56%	50%	70%	65%
% total accepted by women	17%	60%	20%	21%	26%	22%	0	24%	73%	31%	40%	0	44%	44%	36%	30%
% total accepted by men	83%	40%	80%	79%	74%	78%	100%	76%	27%	69%	60%	100%	50%	56%	64%	70%
# of reviews by women	8	N/A	21	N/A	17	4	16.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	N/A	N/A	72.5
# of reviews by men	9	N/A	30	N/A	29	6	30.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	N/A	N/A	117.5
% reviews by women	47%	N/A	41%	N/A	37%	40%	35%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	32%	N/A	N/A	38%
% reviews by men	53%	N/A	59%	N/A	63%	60%	65%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	68%	N/A	N/A	62%
# referees	102	54	33	74	15	134	27	29	19	70	15	28	38	15	82	735
# women referees	35	23	23	27	6	33	10	6	12	19	3	2	22	0	45	266
% of referees who are women	34%	43%	70%	36%	40%	25%	37%	21%	63%	27%	20%	7%	58%	0	55%	36%
# of editorial board members	16	9	4	9	18	14	8	7	13	17	6	6	9	10	N/A	146
# of women on editorial board	9	3	0	3	9	6	4	2	9	7	2	3	3	5	N/A	65
# of minorities on editorial board	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	N/A	3

Table 1: 2007 Journals Survey

% editorial board Women	56%	33%	0	33%	50%	43%	50%	29%	69%	41%	33%	50%	33%	50%	N/A	45%
% editorial board ethnic minorities	0	0	0	0	5%	0	0	0	0	0	17%	0	0	10%	N/A	2%
Editor is a woman	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	6 Yes/ 9 No
Editor belongs to a minority group	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	1 Yes 14 No
Policy on anonymous submissions	REQ	REQ	REQ	REQ	PREF	REQ	REQ	PREF	REQ	REQ	REQ	PREF	Not defined	REQ	REQ	11REQ 3 PREF 1 Undefined
Policy on anonymous referees	REQ	REQ	REQ	REQ	REQ	REQ	REQ	REQ	REQ	REQ	REQ	***	REQ	REQ	REQ	14 REQ
Number of external referees	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	12 use 2 3 use 1

1. *Classical Antiquity* sometimes uses one “external” referee and one editor as the two readers, although this is not their usual practice.
2. *The Classical Bulletin* sometimes requires three referees; for non-scholarly articles in *Quae Supersunt* they may require just one referee.
3. Some of the reviewers for *The Classical Outlook* read more than one article.
4. *Classical Philology* does not solicit information about ethnic or racial minority groups from their editorial board. They use two referees for articles and one [or two] referees for notes.
5. Submission of articles [Item 1] for *Classical World* includes all articles submitted in calendar year 2007. Acceptance of articles [Item 2] includes all articles accepted in 2007 and is not a subset of Item 1. The articles most often were originally submitted in 2007 or, in some cases, even earlier. Item 5 refers to the Editorial Board as constituted for the last issue of the calendar year.
6. Special issue proposals for *Helios* were reviewed by the Editorial Board and one outside reviewer. The inside front cover specifically states that the journal “especially welcomes” articles that focus on feminist theory and gender.
7. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* normally uses one external referee for each submission but will occasionally use two. They note that this version of 2007 statistics may differ from those previously submitted.
8. *Illinois Classical Studies* prefers anonymous submission but some authors, primarily senior Europeans, really don’t care and won’t rewrite to remove their identities. *ICS*’s policy on anonymous refereeing is: “We aim to do as much of our business over the internet as possible, and would [ideally] like our referees’ reports in e-form, either pasted into the text of a message or as a Word attachment [or pdf for reports with Greek]. Be assured that we respect your privacy and will remove any identifiers from the properties before passing them on. If on the other hand you are happy to be identified to the author or even to work with him/her on revisions, let [us] know. We like to thank the referees of accepted articles [along with others who helped us with a given issue of *ICS*] by listing their names discreetly in the editorial preface.” The number of external referees varies according to the nature of the submission. Most submissions go to two referees. If there is local expertise too, and the piece is obviously good or obviously very poor, they will use one. Sometimes they use three, if they need to break a tie or if a referee fails to respond, but then responds later, resulting in three referees.