

## Stephen P. Jenkins Editorial 2015

### Article (Accepted version) (Refereed)

**Original citation:**

Jenkins, Stephen P. (2015) *Editorial 2015*. [The Journal of Economic Inequality](#). ISSN 1569-1721

DOI: [10.1007/s10888-015-9317-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10888-015-9317-z)

© 2015 [Springer Science+Business Media New York](#)

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/64433/>

Available in LSE Research Online: November 2015

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final accepted version of the journal article. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

## Editorial 2015

Stephen P. Jenkins<sup>1</sup>

This editorial is the first of what I hope shall be an annual report to our authors, readers, and referees. At present, there is no easily accessible source of information about acceptance rates and manuscript processing times, editorial policy, nor public acknowledgement of the individuals who help make this journal what it is. This article covers these topics. (For brief reports on ‘journal metrics’ for the previous year, see the journal webpage at <http://www.springer.com/economics/growth/journal/10888>.)

I presented an earlier version of this report to the Editorial Board meeting held in July 2015 in conjunction with the ECINEQ conference at the University of Luxembourg. The statements about editorial policy below were endorsed by the Editorial Board. As the Board meets in person only every second year, my 2016 Editorial Report will be shorter, focusing on publication statistics and acknowledgements.

### Publication statistics

Publication statistics are derived from Springer’s Editorial Manager software, and reflect the situation in mid-2015. I provide comparisons of calendar year 2014 with calendar year 2013.

The *number of submissions* continues to rise. There were 189 Original Research Article submissions in 2014, compared with 173 in 2013. We expect well over 200 submissions for calendar year 2015, having already received 194 submissions of all types between 1 January and 6 October.

The *rejection rate* has been increasing slowly but steadily. For example, the rates for 2008 and 2009 were around 80%. The rejection rate for 2014 was 90%, which is greater than the corresponding rate for 2013 (84%).

The *fraction of submissions that is desk-rejected* has risen markedly from 47% in 2013 to 60% in 2014. When papers are submitted, they are screened by the Editor-in-Chief who may either desk-reject the paper, handle the paper himself (sending the paper to referees), or assign the paper to an Associate Editor to handle. Associate Editors, who have fully devolved powers, may desk-reject papers assigned to them or decide to send them to referees. Papers estimated to have a low chance of eventual publication are now less likely to clog up the system, and we make fewer calls on the precious time of our referees. Desk-rejected authors may be disappointed but I hope that they receive some consolation: we aim to make desk-rejections within seven days of receipt of the submission and also to provide some explanatory comments. Some advice for submitting authors are provided below.

The increase in desk-rejections has also changed the distribution of *manuscript processing times*. According to Springer’s “2014 Publisher’s Report”, the mean number of days from submission to first decision was 88 in 2013 and 53 in 2014. The mean numbers of days to final deposition Accept were 282 (2013) and 407 (2014), and to final deposition Reject were 85 (2013) and 60 (2014). The increase in mean time to final deposition Accept is related to the change-over in Editor-in-Chief that is described below, and we expect the mean for 2015 to be substantially lower than that for 2014.

As regards the *total number of articles published*, there are around 20 Original Research Articles per year, on average. Submissions in 2014 came from 47 countries, including 30

---

<sup>1</sup> London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK. Email: [s.jenkins@lse.ac.uk](mailto:s.jenkins@lse.ac.uk)

from the USA, 21 from Italy, 17 from Spain, and 10 from Germany and India. There are also papers in our Forum and Rediscovered Classics sections, and occasional Special Issues, each of which is discussed further below.

The journal's *Impact Factor* has increased year on year since 2010. It was 1.352 for 2013 and 1.362 for 2014. There are debates about what is an appropriate metric for summarizing journal performance, and Impact Factors are known to be imperfect. The comparability of Impact Factors across disciplines is particularly problematic too. However, Impact Factor data are readily available and we are pleased when our score is increasing!

The 10 *most downloaded papers* from the Springer website in 2014 are shown in Table 1. It is striking that the majority of the papers appeared either in a themed Special Issue, or in the Rediscovered Classics section. The 15 *most cited papers* (according to Google Scholar, as at July 2015) are shown in Table 2, with papers ranked by number of citations per year. Original Article submissions feature more prominently in this table than Table 1 but, nonetheless, a notable fraction appeared either in a themed Special Issue or in the Rediscovered Classics section

**Table 1. Top 10 most downloaded papers from Springer's JEI website, calendar year 2014**

Rank	Number of downloads	Paper	Corresponding Author
1	897	Inequality and growth: evidence from panel cointegration	Vollmer
2	833	The measurement of multidimensional poverty	Bourguignon
3	714	Decomposition procedures for distributional analysis: a unified framework based on the Shapley value	Shorrocks
4	543	Understandings and misunderstandings of multidimensional poverty measurement	Alkire
5	528	The HDI 2010: new controversies, old critiques	Klugman
6	478	Inequality and happiness: insights from Latin America	Graham
7	433	The origins of the Gini index: extracts from <i>Variabilità e Mutabilità</i> (1912) by Corrado Gini	Ceriani
8	424	A vulnerability approach to the definition of the middle class	López-Calva
9	391	The Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) poverty measures: 25 years later	Thorbecke
10	380	Polarization and the decline of the middle class: Canada and the U.S.	Foster

**Table 2. Top 15 JEI papers ranked by number of citations per year (as at July 2015)**

Rank	Cites per year	Cites	Authors	Title	Year
1	312.0	624	AF Shorrocks	Decomposition procedures for distributional analysis: a unified framework based on the Shapley value	2013
2	89.0	89	LF Lopez-Calva, E Ortiz-Juarez	A vulnerability approach to the definition of the middle class	2014
3	78.2	938	F Bourguignon, SR Chakravarty	The measurement of multidimensional poverty	2003
4	45.0	180	S Alkire, J Foster	Understandings and misunderstandings of multidimensional poverty measurement	2011
5	41.8	167	M Ravallion	On multidimensional indices of poverty	2011
6	40.8	326	J Esteban, C Gradín, D Ray	An extension of a measure of polarization, with an application to the income distribution of five OECD countries	2007
7	37.3	448	AB Atkinson	Multidimensional deprivation: contrasting social welfare and counting approaches	2003
8	35.6	178	D Checchi, V Peragine	Inequality of opportunity in Italy	2010
9	35.5	142	J Klugman, F Rodríguez, HJ Choi	The HDI 2010: new controversies, old critiques	2011
10	34.9	314	F Bourguignon, A Spadaro	Microsimulation as a tool for evaluating redistribution policies	2006
11	27.0	27	EN Wolff, M Gittleman	Inheritances and the distribution of wealth or whatever happened to the great inheritance boom?	2014
12	25.0	125	GS Fields	Does income mobility equalize longer-term incomes? New measures of an old concept	2010
13	22.6	113	JE Foster, MC Wolfson	Polarization and the decline of the middle class: Canada and the US	2010
14	21.3	192	C Graham, A Felton	Inequality and happiness: insights from Latin America	2006
15	20.7	62	W Bossert, SR Chakravarty, C d'Ambrosio	Poverty and time	2012

Note: Extracted on 2015-07-06 using Harzing's Publish or Perish<sup>TM</sup> software (statistics derived from Google Scholar).

### Special Issue and Forum papers

Special Issue (SI) and Forum papers are clearly popular with JEI readers, as the download and citation statistics indicate. Forum topics are proposed by the Forum Editor (Nora Lustig), and final decisions about whether to proceed and, if so, how much journal space is available for them, are made after discussion with the Editor-in-Chief. The commissioning of the Forum papers themselves, and their subsequent handling, is done by the Forum Editor. Agreed and currently in planning is a Forum on 'Global poverty lines', handled by Nora Lustig together with Jacques Silber (founding Editor-in-Chief).

Decisions about SIs are taken by the Editor-in-Chief in consultation with the Associate Editors and occasionally more widely. An SI on 'Cross-national databases on inequality', with guest editors Chico Ferreira and Nora Lustig, is to be published in issue 4 of 2015. Since February 2014, I have received two SI proposals and turned both down after consultation.

Given the popularity of SI and Forum papers, one might ask whether we might have more of them. Our views on this issue are influenced by factors in addition to popularity. First, the opportunity cost of SI and Forum papers is reduced publication space or increased

publication delays for Ordinary Research Articles. (Springer owns the journal; they set the page budgets in advance; and there are four journal issues per year. Unlike some other journals which are owned by an association, we cannot run additional issues to accommodate special issues even if a proposer offers to fund them.) Second, and related, although SI and Forum papers usually receive comments from their handling editor, they are typically invited papers and not subject to quite the same anonymous refereeing process. The papers are often by senior authors already well-known in the profession. And yet a journal's reputation for research quality is strongly determined by its publication of peer-reviewed articles from a submission process open to all. Third, it is harder to monitor and administer the editorial process, and to maintain a consistent editorial policy across all of the articles published in the JEI, if SIs are guest-edited by people who are not Editors (or Editorial Board members).

At its 2015 meeting, the Editorial Board agreed that we need to be careful about expanding the proportion of SI and Forum papers. It recognised the popularity of SI and Forum papers but recommended that we continue to operate a relatively conservative attitude towards commissioning them. In particular, it was agreed that SIs only be approved if the guest editor(s) is an existing JEI editor, a former editor, or a member of the Editorial Board. In this connection, the Board noted that the Forum section is like a smaller version of a SI, but without the editorial policy issue cited above. Submit suggestions for Special Issues to the Editor-in-Chief and for Forums to the Forum Editor.

### **Rediscovered Classics**

Under the expert guidance of Peter Lambert, the JEI has published much research of interest to the readership. However, over the two years, proposals have almost dried up. Given the popularity of the section to date, the Editorial Board endorsed my proposal that the journal continue to publish Rediscovered Classics if we receive suitable proposals. In addition, because Peter is unable to continue in his post, the handling of new proposals will now be undertaken by the Editor-in-Chief. One proposal is currently under consideration. Readers are invited to email me with additional suggestions.

### **Assorted other changes**

Referees are now automatically blind copied into emails containing decisions made by the editors. We believe it is useful to provide feedback to referees about the fate of papers that they have commented on, and there are benefits to referees from reading the comments of editors and other reviewers.

The journal now uses the Harvard (author-date) style for citations and references rather than a numbering style. I believe the change should improve the reader's experience (it is much more informative to see text referring to, say, "(Ferreira, 2013)" rather than "[7]"); it is easier for authors to prepare lists of References using an author-date style; and, with such a style, it is easier for me to correct proofs of accepted articles and impose the journal's house style consistently (the Editor in Chief sees all proofs).

When authors submit a paper via Editorial Manager, they must explicitly declare that the paper contains original work and that it is not also under submission at another journal. Occasional instances of simultaneous submission have come to light. In such cases, the paper is withdrawn from the system and the author is banned from submitting to the journal for a period.

## Replication policy for empirical papers

Economics journals are increasingly moving towards implementation of a replication policy of some kind for empirical papers. So too are other journals in quantitative social science and cognate disciplines. An early leader in Economics was the *Journal of Human Resources*. Other journals with related policies now include *American Economic Association* journals, the *Economic Journal*, the *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, and the journal(s) of the *Royal Statistical Society*. The policies differ a lot in their interpretation and implementation. For a useful summary of the current state-of-play, see Duvendack, Palmer-Jones, and Reed (2015).

Other things being equal, the ability to check the replicability of empirical work is good for social science in general, and for this journal and its readership in particular. Also, replicability would put empirical research on a more equal footing with theoretical research: theorists are expected to provide proofs for their theorems. But instituting a replication policy for empirical papers raises non-trivial issues. They include the following.

What materials would authors have to make available for replication purposes? We may distinguish several types of *data*: (a) original parent database(s); and (b) databases derived from these by authors for their analysis. In addition, data may be (i) freely downloadable, (ii) available through a data archive (requiring registration, but usually without cost), or (iii) proprietary or secure data, with access restricted to users satisfying e.g. data security requirements, and/or paying requisite fees to their owners. In addition to data, there are the all-important *code scripts*: (A) code used to extract data from parent databases, (re)organise the data, and create derived variables; and (B) code for the analysis. Code scripts are usually software dependent, and/or different software is used for data extraction, management, or analysis. Having data without code scripts is largely useless for replication. But having code scripts – of both types A and B – may be sufficient, because replication exercises can still be undertaken if the replicator has access to the data by other means.

From an author's perspective, there are incentives against making replication materials available. It is costly in terms of time, and perhaps money, to prepare replication materials in a form that can be made publicly available, and (depending on the nature of the policy) to archive the materials. There are potential risk-to-reputation costs were replicators unable to replicate published research findings or to find errors that made findings non-robust. These problems are difficult to address except collectively, e.g. by journals making some form of replication provision a condition of publication. On the other hand, some researchers derive a 'warm glow' from making replication materials available and are willing to provide them themselves. But they are relatively rare.

From a journal's perspective, there are the costs of maintaining webpage archives of replication materials (if journals rather than authors are responsible for the repository). More fundamentally, there are serious issues of monitoring and enforcement, with the costs of these dependent on the nature of materials (data and/or code scripts) required to be archived. Comprehensive monitoring and enforcement could not be done with this journal's editorial resources. Moreover, the nature of any journal-based replication archive and its maintenance would need to be agreed with Springer, the journal's owner. There is also a potential issue that, if the journal were to implement a comprehensive replication policy, it might deter authors of potentially good papers from submitting to the journal and we would lose them to our competitors.

In sum, there are many difficult issues to address and resolve in the design of a replication policy for empirical papers. At its 2015 meeting, the Editorial Board supported moves towards more replication in principle but recognised the costs as well as the benefits. In the interim, it was agreed that authors of empirical papers should be encouraged to self-

archive the materials associated with their papers – both data (if feasible) and code scripts – and to make them freely accessible.

Potential archive locations could be the author's personal or institutional website, or free or cheap cloud-based storage such as provided by Dropbox<sup>TM</sup> and similar providers. There are also specialist hosts such as Harvard Dataverse (<https://dataverse.harvard.edu/>) with fee-free provision of opportunities to “Share, publish, and archive your data. Find and cite data across all research fields.” Code scripts can also be deposited there.

The journal will look favourably on empirical papers that provide access to replication materials, and prefers that this access be given at submission time as well as at publication. There are various ways of announcing access. One would be to include statements in the Acknowledgements section along the lines of: “Replication materials (code and data) are available from <http://URL-of-website>” or “Replication materials (code and data) are available from the corresponding author” who would then provide the materials to enquirers on a one to one basis or via a web link.

The journal will consider the publication of replication studies of previously-published papers on their merits. They should be submitted as Original Research Articles in the usual way. Currently we have no plans to have a separate Replication Section.

### **Advice for authors submitting Original Research Articles**

Given the high rejection rate, authors might reasonably ask what factors make acceptance of their submission more likely. Here follows some advice.

- (a) Ensure that your article's subject falls within the journal's scope. We continue to receive submissions that should clearly have been sent to a different journal and these are desk-rejected immediately. No particular subject or approach to the analysis of economic inequality is privileged or deprecated. However, issues regarding scope do more commonly arise for papers addressing topics that span other fields and their journals, whether theoretical or empirical in approach. For example, for us to consider a submission about trade and inequality, or inequality and growth, it needs to squarely address the economic inequality dimension in order to persuade us that this journal is an appropriate target. The same is true for papers considering the inter-relationships between the income distribution and the labour market, public policy, or demography. Recent issues provide a guide to our coverage. We seek high quality articles focusing on “economic inequality”, broadly defined, that are of interest to our international readership. For more details of our scope, see the journal's website at <http://www.springer.com/economics/growth/journal/10888>.
- (b) Ensure your article provides a clear “contribution” to the analysis of economic inequality. Communicate what it is and focus on it. For example, if the methods you use are well-known and so your innovation is in the particular application, do not waste space explaining the former in great detail. Single country studies are acceptable, but ensure that the issues addressed or methods employed are of wide interest and relevance. More generally, ask: what is the research question that you are addressing, why is it important, and what answer do you provide? Communicate and justify the answers to these questions to our target readership.
- (c) Work hard on your Introduction and Conclusions sections and also your Abstract (as well as the rest of your analysis). These are the sections that the editors and referees look at first and are also of great importance to non-specialist readers. You need to write in a way that persuades these groups to read your paper further. There is an apocryphal story about the former editor of a top economics journal who said that if he did not understand what

the paper was about by the end of the first page, it was desk-rejected. We don't employ explicit rules of thumb like this but please note the message well. Abstracts should not be longer than around 150 words. "Conclusions" sections should focus on the genuine conclusions to be drawn from the article. They might also indicate promising lines for future research. Too often these sections simply contain a summary – this is redundant repetition.

- (d) Do not submit "review articles" or "survey articles". The journal does not publish them. Short "notes" or "comments" are not published either (with rare exceptions).
- (e) Do not submit articles that are too long. Polish your prose to improve succinctness and focus and to remove repetition. The average length of a published article is around 20 journal pages, so aim for that target at submission stage. To do this, make judicious use of an appendix to contain proofs and sensitivity analyses (for example). Few appendices are published along with articles, but we can make them available as Online Supplementary Material hosted on Springer's webpages with a hyperlink from the main text. Currently there are no length restrictions on these online appendices. Clearly indicate at the time of submission which materials are intended to appear in an online appendix.
- (f) Use footnotes sparingly and avoid long footnotes. If there are more footnotes than pages of your main text, that is a strong signal that there is a problem. So too is a footnote of more than a few sentences. Do not include equations. Some journals ban footnotes altogether on the grounds that something worth saying is either worth saying in the main text or not at all. We allow footnotes but are sympathetic to the reasoning.
- (g) Prepare tables and figures with the same care and diligence as the rest of your article: they are an essential component of the effective communication of your analysis. Readers should be able to understand most of what a table or figure shows without consulting the main text. Use explanatory notes if necessary. For examples of standard table formats used by the journal, consult recent issues. In tables, do not use colour or shading, and omit vertical lines. In figures, ensure that there are appropriate axis titles, axis labels, and legends. Give careful consideration to using black and white and grey shades rather than colour. Although the journal has the facility to publish graphs in colour in the online version, the hard copy version and what most readers see when they print articles out is black and white, and legibility is often lost if colour used. Appropriate choice of marker symbols and line patterns may help avoid this problem. If you do use colour, select shades that colour-blind readers can distinguish. Put figure titles and notes in the article text, not in the graph itself.
- (h) Authors of empirical papers are recommended to produce replication materials. See the discussion earlier. Authors of theoretical papers should continue to provide proofs or other relevant derivations (but see also the remarks about judicious use of appendices above).
- (i) Authors whose first language is not English are recommended to have their submission copy-edited by a native English speaker.
- (j) Submit a polished 'final' version, not a version which you think might be tidied up later in the process or a version for which you hope referees will help resolve unresolved issues. To this end, get feedback on your paper – and be prepared to revise it multiple times – prior to submission. Papers that are insufficiently well developed face a high desk-rejection risk.

Potential submitters might also reflect on the advice of Maureen Pirog, long-time editor of the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. She discusses a "top 10 list of things that prospective authors should and should not do if they want to publish their work" (2014: 843). Most of her points are generic, and hence also relevant for submission to this journal.



## References

- Duvendack, M., Palmer-Jones, R. W., and Reed, W. R. (2015). Replications in Economics: a progress report. *Econ Journal Watch*, 12(2), 164–191. Downloadable from <http://econjwatch.org/articles/replications-in-economics-a-progress-report>.
- Pirog, M. A. (2014). The art and science of scholarly publishing. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33 (3), 843–853.

## Acknowledgements

I took over as JEI Editor-in-Chief from Chico Ferreira from 1 February 2014. I thank Chico for his support and advice, and for continuing to handle the submissions under his care until Autumn 2014 (after which I took over the balance remaining). I am pleased that Chico continues on the Editorial Board.

I couldn't do my job without the contributions of the *Associate Editors*: Andrea Brandolini, Valentino Dardanoni, Markus Jäntti, Cecilia Garcia-Peñalosa, and Buhong Zheng. I thank them all. Buhong resigned at the end of 2014 due to other commitments but saw out the remaining papers under his charge. We are grateful for his service and glad that he continues on the Editorial Board. I am pleased to welcome as new Associate Editors Dirk Van de gaer (from August 2015) and Olivier Bargain (from October 2015).

Also making substantial contributions to the JEI are Nora Lustig (Forum Editor), Xavi Ramos (Book Review Editor), and Peter Lambert (Rediscovered Classics Editor). After long and distinguished service, Peter has resigned his post but we shall continue the section (see above).

Our eminent *Advisory Council* continues to be: Tony Atkinson, François Bourguignon, Nanak Kakwani, Serge-Christophe Kolm, and Amartya Sen.

I am also pleased to acknowledge the support and advice of the *Editorial Board*, the members of which are listed in the journal and on Springer's website. To be able to call on such an august body of individuals for advice and support is invaluable for developing the journal's editorial policy. The general responsibilities of a member, agreed at the 2013 and 2015 Editorial Board meetings, are as follows:

First and foremost, the Editorial Board provides overall editorial guidance and direction to the Journal's Editor in Chief and Associate Editors. ... [E]ditorial board members are also expected to assist the Editors with timely referee reports, when requested, at least some two or three times per year. In addition, at our [2013] meeting, Board members agreed to provide "emergency referee reports" on a short notice, in those (relatively rare) situations in which referees are excessively late with their reports, and the Editor in charge of the paper feels that he or she cannot make a well-informed decision on the basis of a single report. This new commitment was suggested as a means to reduce review delays in the Journal. Requests of this nature remain infrequent – but they are certainly a possibility.

The Editorial Board also agreed in 2015 that the existing policy of gradual refreshment of its membership be continued. Springer devolves the choice of Editorial Board membership (and Associate Editors), entirely to the Editor-in-Chief, but of course I take advice on these matters before making decisions. If you have suggestions, send them directly to me.

I value the advice and assistance received from the *Springer team*, especially the following individuals: Lorraine Klimowich (Senior Editor), Allan Nebres and (from October

2014) Janelle Caculba (Editorial Assistants), plus Barney Boy Cutamora (Journals Production).

Finally, we should pay tribute to those individuals who have given their time and expertise to refereeing papers for us.

## Referees in 2014

We would like to express our gratitude for the assistance of the following individuals who agreed to referee articles during Calendar Year 2014:

Rolf	Aaberge	Rafael	Domenech	Julie	Litchfield	Timothy	Smeeding
Antonio	Abatemarco	Markus	Eberhardt	Haiyong	Liu	Ricardo	Sousa
Adrian	Adermon	Tor	Eriksson	Joan	Llull	David	Stifel
Jim	Alm	John	Ermisch	Brice	Magdalou	Steve	Stillman
Yoram	Amiel	Fernanda	Estevan	Elisabetta	Magnani	Brennan	Thompson
Gordon	Anderson	Ivan	Faiella	Paul	Makdissi	Aurelio	Tobias
James	Ang	Hans	Fehr	Tuomas	Malinen	Pietro	Tommasino
Benedicte	Apouey	Martin	Feldkircher	Marco	Manacorda	Florencia	Torche
Joao Pedro	Azevedo	Priscila	Ferreira	Fabio	Mariani	Jenny	Torssander
Francisco	Azpitarte	Ada	Ferrer-i-Carbonell	Pekka	Martikainen	Matti	Tuomala
Elena	Barcena-Martin	Gary	Fields	James	McDonald	Renos	Vakis
Steve	Beckman	Carlo	Fiorio	Paul	McNelis	Justin	Valasek
Rui	Benfica	John	Fitzgerald	Luca	Merlino	Robert	Valletta
Christopher	Bennett	Liana	Fox	Branko	Milanovic	Philippe	Van Kerm
Simone	Bertoli	Tommaso	Frattini	Anirban	Mitra	Tom	Van Ourti
Martin	Biewen	Nobuhiko	Fuwa	Valentine	Moghadam	Arthur	van Soest
John	Bishop	Francisco	Gallego	Salvatore	Morelli	Gerlinde	Verbist
Rene	Boeheim	Robert	Gary-Bobo	Alexander	Mosthaf	Gregory	Verdugo
Kristof	Bosmans	Chiara	Gigliarano	Redzo	Mujcic	Sarah	Voitchovsky
Bruce	Bradbury	Jeremie	Gignoux	Stephane	Mussard	Oscar	Volij
Julia	Bredtmann	Paul	Glewwe	Renata	Narita	Daniel	Waldenstrom
Richard	Breen	Carlos	Gradin	Ronald	Oaxaca	Daniel	Westbrook
Ylenia	Brilli	Carol	Graham	Donal	O'Neill	Bradley	Wimmer
Richard	Brown	Paul	Gregg	Eduardo	Ortiz-Juarez	Gaston	Yalonzky
Paolo	Brunori	John	Haisken-DeNew	Berkay	Ozcan	Kazuhiro	Yamamoto
Gustaf	Bruze	Susan	Harkness	Flaviana	Palmisano	Shlomo	Yitzhaki
Isabel	Cairo	Tarjei	Havnes	Fabrizio	Panebianco	Buhong	Zheng
Lisa	Cameron	Ruth	Hill	Eugenio	Peluso	Natalia	Zinovyeva
Raymundo	Campos-Vazquez	Emilio	Huet-Vaughn	Vito	Peragine	Claudio	Zoli
Lorenzo	Cappellari	Gordon	Hughes	Jukka	Pirttilä		
Alessandra	Casarico	William	Jack	Nicolas	Pistoiesi		
Amparo	Castello	John	Jerrim	Maria Grazia	Pittau		
Arpita	Chatterjee	Lamia	Kandil	Andre	Portela de Souza		
Luc	Christiaensen	Loukas	Karabarbounis	Nick	Powdthavee		
Federico	Cingano	Murat	Kirdar	Esteban	Puentes		
Andrew	Clark	Gustav	Kjellsson	Paul	Ramskogler		
Fabio	Clementi	Stephan	Klasen	Michael	Ransom		
Fabrizio	Colonna	Christian	Kleiber	Sean	Reardon		
Frank	Cowell	Stephen	Knowles	Philipp	Rehm		
Alberto	Dalmazzo	Martyna	Kobus	Giacomo	Rodano		
Conchita	D'Ambrosio	Martyna	Kobus	Jesper	Roine		
Sara	De La Rica	Wolfgang	Kuhle	Laurence	Roope		
Joyee	Deb	Audun	Langorgen	Mariacristina	Rossi		
Koen	Decancq	Peter	Lanjouw	Anna	rosso		
Andre	Decoster	Casilda	Lasso de la Vega	Francois	Rycx		
Uwe	Deichmann	Junsoo	Lee	Ernesto	Savaglio		
Coral	Del Rio	Marco	Leonardi	Christian	Schluter		
Manthos	Delis	Peter	Levell	Suman	Seth		
George	Deltas	Guay	Lim	Dina	Shatnawi		
Walter	Distaso	Joanne	Lindley	Eva	Sierminska		