

Critical Studies in Media Communication

Report of the Editor-Elect

MANUSCRIPT DATA SUPPLIED BY T&F

New manuscripts submitted 8/1/24-7/31/25: 434

Revised manuscripts received 8/1/24-7/31/25: 181

Accepted manuscripts 8/1/24-7/31/25: 44

Rejected manuscripts 8/1/24-7/31/25: 358

Acceptance rate: 7%

New manuscripts submitted in 2025 through 9/16: 369

Revised manuscripts submitted in 2025 through 9/16: 97

Accepted manuscripts in 2025 through 9/16: 58

Rejected manuscripts in 2025 through 9/16: 408

Acceptance rate through 9/16: 12%

EDITOR'S GOALS AND PROGRESS

In my application letter for the editorship, I articulated three central values that together constitute my goals as an editor: diversity, timeliness, and quality. I have sought diversity in manuscripts submitted by intentionally expressing openness in the call for papers to a range of appropriate methodologies and topics, with a particular interest in work that centers marginalized perspectives. I have circulated the call broadly, reaching out to the officers of several divisions and caucuses of major communication and media studies associations to send the call for papers on their email lists. I also recruited a diverse set of scholars to serve as the editorial board and as ad hoc reviewers. The group is diverse with respect to age, race, gender, country, gender identity, career level, institution type, and more.

Regarding quality, I aim to send each relevant manuscript to three reviewers. When I send a revise and resubmit decision, I include a letter that synthesizes the reviews and

highlights what I see as the central tasks for the revision. I also include copyediting notes and other comments from my read of the essay. Several authors have thanked me for my thorough approach, and I am pleased with the quality of the manuscripts forthcoming for the 2026 issues (some of which have already appeared online).

In terms of timeliness, I aim to make initial decisions about sending an essay for review or desk rejecting it within a few days of receiving the piece in my queue. I have generally held to that. Once a piece is under review, I try to make sure no author waits more than 90 days for a decision. Although some reviewers vanish after agreeing to review a piece, I generally hold to this guideline.

STRENGTHS

- Excellent reviewers who provide quality feedback to authors!
- A robust number of regular submissions.
- Substantial interest from university presses in having their books reviewed at CSMC.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Many, many, many submissions are wholly inappropriate and get desk rejected. Of these, several are outside the aims and scope (e.g., psychological studies of media effects), not topical (i.e., vaguely about media but not citing any research from communication studies), or severely underdeveloped (e.g., poorly edited and incomprehensible, entirely AI-generated, etc.).
- Some manuscript reviews are delayed by struggles with finding reviewers; in some cases, I need to invite nine or more readers to find two who say yes.

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION

- Call for papers distributed widely and emphasizes diversity.
- Editorial board and ad hoc reviewers are diverse.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Leland G. Spencer".

Leland G. Spencer, Editor-Elect

Critical Studies in Media Communication