

AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION OF SPECIALIZED LAW REVIEWS

TRACEY E. GEORGE* AND CHRIS GUTHRIE**

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	813
II.	THE RISE OF THE SPECIALIZED LAW REVIEW.....	814
	A. <i>The Spark</i>	815
	B. <i>The Explosion</i>	817
	1. <i>Law School Expansion</i>	818
	2. <i>Law Faculty Needs</i>	819
	3. <i>Law Student Demands</i>	820
	C. <i>The Current State of Affairs</i>	821
III.	RANKING METHODOLOGY.....	824
IV.	THE RANKINGS.....	831
V.	CONCLUSION.....	836

I. INTRODUCTION

[T]he *Harvard Law Review* might become what is consistent with its traditions, a journal of legal history; the *Yale Law Journal* might become a journal of jurisprudence; and the *Columbia Law Review* might become a journal of commercial law.¹

The Harvard Law School has not converted the venerable *Harvard Law Review* into the *Harvard Legal History Review*, the Yale Law School has not abandoned its *Journal* in favor of the *Yale Journal on Jurisprudence*, and the Columbia Law School has not replaced its *Review* with the *Columbia Review of Commercial Law*. Rather than *replacing* their generalist reviews with specialized reviews, the Harvard, Yale, and Columbia law schools (like most American law schools)² have responded to the call for specialization by *adding* “specialized” or “secondary” reviews³ to their roster

* Associate Professor of Law and Adjunct Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Missouri. B.A., B.S., Southern Methodist University, 1989; J.D., Stanford Law School, 1992.

** Associate Professor of Law and Senior Fellow, Center for the Study of Dispute Resolution, University of Missouri. B.A., Stanford University, 1989; Ed.M., Harvard University, 1991; J.D., Stanford Law School, 1994. We would like to thank Brad Joondeph, Russell Korobkin, William Landes, and Jeff Rachlinski for their helpful comments. We would also like to thank our research assistants Thom Bassett, Erik Edwards, Mo Mitra-Edwards, Elizabeth Thrower, and Becky Williams. Finally, we appreciate support from the University of Missouri Law School Foundation.

1. A.K. [Albert Kocourek], *Editorial Notes, The Law Review*, 21 ILL. L. REV. 147, 153 (1926).

2. Nearly three-quarters of ABA-approved American law schools (126 out of 179) currently publish a specialized review in addition to their primary law review. *See infra* Part II.C.

3. “Secondary,” “specialized,” or “specialty” law reviews “are journals that focus exclusively on a particular field or area of law, such as environmental law, international law, intellectual property law, labor law, tax law, and many others.” Michael L. Closten & Robert J. Dzielak, *The History and Influence of the Law Review Institution*, 30 AKRON L. REV. 15,

of publications.⁴ Currently, Harvard, Yale, and Columbia collectively publish three generalist law reviews as well as *twenty-six specialized law reviews*, not one of which existed three decades ago.

The sudden, rapid, and widespread increase in the number of specialized law reviews has attracted relatively little scholarly attention even though it is the most significant development in legal academic publishing in the second half of the twentieth century.⁵ As a consequence, there is a dearth of information about the proliferation, significance, and status of specialized reviews. In this Article, we attempt to fill this information gap by documenting the rise of the specialized review and by providing an empirical ranking of the top 100 specialized reviews.⁶

II. THE RISE OF THE SPECIALIZED LAW REVIEW

Law schools began to publish law reviews in the late nineteenth century.⁷ The first student-edited law reviews appeared briefly at the

16 (1996). "The articles in specialty law reviews are limited to addressing issues within the scope of that specialty law review." *Id.* at 39.

4. A few schools have opted to publish as their primary review a specialized, rather than a generalist, review. See, e.g., Jordan H. Leibman & James P. White, *How the Student-Edited Law Journals Make Their Publication Decisions*, 39 J. LEGAL EDUC. 387, 388 n.10 (1989). Examples of specialty journals that operate as the school's primary journal include the *Journal of Family Law* at the University of Louisville Law School, the *Land and Water Law Review* at the University of Wyoming College of Law, the *Journal of Environmental Law* at the Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College, and the *Journal of Corporate Law* at the Delaware School of Law at Widener University. See *id.* But see Roberta S. Mitchell, *The Founding of Capital's Law Review: A Retrospective*, 25 CAP. U. L. REV. 237, 240-43 (1996) (describing Capital's decision to publish a specialized journal on "corrections and institutional control" in 1971, and its subsequent decision in 1976 to convert its specialized journal into a generalist journal). Interestingly, of the four schools cited by Leibman and White, three also publish secondary journals: the University of Louisville publishes the *Journal of Law and Education* with the University of South Carolina; Widener began publishing the *Widener Journal of Public Law* in 1992; and Lewis and Clark introduced *Animal Law* in 1995 and the *Journal of Small and Emerging Business Law* in 1997.

5. Specialized law reviews have received incidental attention as part of the attention given the general law review phenomenon. See generally Mike Antoline, *The New Law Reviews*, 17 STUDENT LAW. 26 (May 1989); Closen & Dzielak, *supra* note 3; Bernard J. Hibbits, *Last Writes? Reassessing the Law Review in the Age of Cyberspace*, 71 N.Y.U. L. REV. 615 (1996); Leibman & White, *supra* note 4; E. Joshua Rosenkranz, *Law Review's Empire*, 39 HASTINGS L.J. 859 (1988).

6. While we provide rankings of the top 100 specialized reviews only, see *infra* p. 831-35 tbl.4, we coded and ranked 285 specialized reviews. For a discussion on the ranking methodology, see *infra* Part III.

7. The law review institution has received a great deal of attention. See generally *supra* sources cited in note 5; see also Roger C. Cramton, *The Most Remarkable Institution: The American Law Review*, 36 J. LEGAL EDUC. 1 (1986); James W. Harper, *Why Student-Run Law Reviews?*, 82 MINN. L. REV. 1261 (1998); Michael I. Swygert & Jon W. Bruce, *The Historical Origins, Founding, and Early Development of Student-Edited Law Reviews*, 36 HASTINGS L.J. 739 (1985).

Some of the attention has been favorable to the law review. See, e.g., Richard S. Harnsberger, *Reflections About Law Reviews and American Legal Scholarship*, 76 NEB. L. REV.

Albany Law School in 1875⁸ and the Columbia Law School in 1885,⁹ but the Harvard Law School introduced the first successful law review in 1887.¹⁰ Other law schools soon followed suit,¹¹ and by the turn of the century seven schools published generalist law reviews.¹²

A. *The Spark*

Shortly after the turn of the century, scholars began to express concern about the proliferation of generalist reviews and to recommend specialization as a potential solution to the proliferation "problem."¹³ During this "first wave" of law review criticism, the faculty editors of the *Illinois Law Review* argued, for instance, that the "field for law reviews of a general character is already overcrowded."¹⁴ Albert Kocourek recommended that law schools publish specialized reviews¹⁵ and even suggested that some of the leading

681, 707 (1997) ("After reading and reflecting upon American law reviews for more than fifty years, I am convinced the student-run reviews are a unique and uniquely American tradition that is best left as is."); Earl Warren, *Messages of Greeting to the U.C.L.A. Law Review*, 1 UCLA L. REV. 1, 1 (1953) ("The American law review properly has been called the most remarkable institution of the law school world. To a lawyer, its articles and comments may be indispensable professional tools. To a judge, whose decisions provide grist for the law review mill, the review may be both a severe critic and a helpful guide. But perhaps most important, the review affords invaluable training to the students who participate in its writing and editing.").

Some attention, of course, has not been favorable. See Hibbitts, *supra* note 5, at 628-54 (analyzing the three "waves" of law review criticism). For the most famous attack launched against the law review, see Fred Rodell, *Goodbye to Law Reviews*, 23 VA. L. REV. 38, 38 (1936) (identifying "style" and "content" as the two problems with law reviews); and Fred Rodell, *Goodbye to Law Reviews-Revisited*, 48 VA. L. REV. 279 (1962).

8. The *Albany Law School Journal* was introduced in 1875 and lasted one year. See FREDERICK C. HICKS, MATERIALS AND METHODS OF LEGAL RESEARCH 150 (2d ed. 1933).

9. The *Columbia Jurist* was introduced in 1885 and lasted two years. The *Columbia Law Times* appeared in 1887 and lasted until 1893. See *id.*

10. See *id.*; see also Cramton, *supra* note 7, at 3 ("Although short-lived, student-edited law reviews appeared at Albany Law School in 1875 and Columbia in 1885, the oldest continuous such publication was founded at Harvard in 1887."). See generally Swygert & Bruce, *supra* note 7, at 763-78. The *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* is "a lineal successor to the *American Law Register*, which originated in 1852," but states 1896 as its own beginning date. LAW SCHOOL ADMISSION COUNCIL, THE OFFICIAL GUIDE TO U.S. LAW SCHOOLS 1998, at 289 (1997).

11. See Afton Dekanal, *Faculty-Edited Law Reviews: Should the Law Schools Join the Rest of Academe?*, 57 UMKC L. REV. 233, 235 (1989) (contending that "for virtually all schools except Harvard, student-edited law journals came into being because that is what Harvard did").

12. See HICKS, *supra* note 8, at 150.

13. Bernard Hibbitts asserts that this "first, weakest, and most diffuse wave of criticism [of the law review] lasted roughly from 1905 to 1940" and was largely "a reaction against the relatively rapid proliferation of school-sponsored legal journals in the early decades of the twentieth century." Hibbitts, *supra* note 5, at 629.

14. *Editorial Notes*, 1 ILL. L. REV. 39, 39 (1906).

15. See A.K., *supra* note 1, at 151-52. Kocourek wrote:

But there is also need of specialism in law journalism. We have already, for example, a specialized *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* and a *Journal of International Law*. Instead of adding to the long list of law reviews, it would be

law reviews convert from a broad focus to a narrow one.¹⁶

Prompted in part by criticisms like these, law schools responded by organizing symposium issues of their generalist reviews¹⁷ and by publishing a handful of specialized reviews. Northwestern University Law School introduced the first specialized review, the *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology*,¹⁸ in 1910.¹⁹ In the 1930s and 1940s, law schools published five more specialty journals:²⁰ the *Journal of Air Law*, co-edited by Northwestern, the University of Southern California, Washington University, and the Air Law Institute;²¹ the *Journal of Legal Education*, published by the Association of American Law Schools and edited by the faculty of law at Duke University;²² *Law and Contemporary Problems*, an interdisciplinary symposium-only review published by Duke Law School; and New York University's *Annual Survey of American Law*²³ and *Tax Law Review*.²⁴ David Cavers, the founding faculty edi-

desirable for legal science if efforts were made to establish scientific journals of specialized commercial law, public law, civil procedure, legislation, legal history, conflict of laws, jurisprudence, comparative law, and philosophy of law, to mention some of the most important fields of specialism.

Id.

16. See *supra* text accompanying note 1.

17. The first symposium issues of law reviews emerged prior to this period, however. See Clozen & Dzielak, *supra* note 3, at 21 (noting that the first symposium issue appeared in the *American Law Review* in 1889).

18. Northwestern shortened the name of this specialty journal to the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* in 1931. See Editorials, 22 J. CRIM. L. & CRIMINOLOGY 3, 3 (1931).

19. There were a few specialized legal periodicals in print prior to 1910, but they were commercially produced, rather than law school-affiliated, publications. See Swygert & Bruce, *supra* note 7, at 762 (noting that by 1875 the *Insurance Law Journal*, the *Medico-Legal Journal*, the *Bankrupt Register*, the *International Revenue Record* and *Custom Journal*, and the *American Civil Law Journal* were in publication).

20. The Federal Communications Bar Association introduced the *Federal Communications Bar Journal* in 1936. In 1977 the Association began publishing its journal with UCLA and changed its name to the *Federal Communications Law Journal*. See Masthead, 30 FED. COMM. L.J. at i, i (1977).

21. The *Journal of Air Law* was renamed the *Journal of Air Law and Commerce* in 1939, see 10 J. AIR L. & COM. 1, 1 (1939), and has been published since 1962 by Southern Methodist University. See Masthead, 28 J. AIR L. & COM. at i, i (1962).

22. See Brainard Currie, *Concerning the Journal*, 1 J. LEGAL EDUC. 309, 309 (1948-49) (describing the events culminating in the publication of the first issue in autumn 1948).

23. NYU Dean Arthur Vanderbilt created the *Annual Survey* as an American counterpart to the *Annual Survey of English Law* published by the London School of Economics and Political Science. See Julius J. Marke, *The Annual Survey of American Law at Fifty*, 1992/93 ANN. SURV. AM. L. 1, 1-6. He hoped that "[e]xpanding the number of law school publications would both add prestige and serve as a medium for promoting Law Center programs." *Id.* at 1-2. Originally, Vanderbilt envisioned NYU faculty contributing and editing articles for every volume, but students eventually took over most of the editorial work and some of the writing as well. See *id.* at 1-6.

24. See Arthur T. Vanderbilt, *Foreword*, 1 TAX L. REV. 1, 1-2 (1945) ("The *Tax Law Review* has been instituted with the aim of presenting authoritative articles, the utility and value of which will prove lasting as the subject permits, while at the same time serving as a guide to the scattered writings published elsewhere. Though devoted primarily to the expo-

tor of *Law & Contemporary Problems*, made a plea for more specialized law reviews:

The type of periodical which would best subserve the ends which I believe the law review has neglected is one which would be limited to a specific field of human activity but which would develop all its aspects which are properly of concern to the lawyer, the "client," the judge, the legislator, and the legal scholar.²⁵

Despite Cavers' plea, however, relatively few law schools inaugurated specialty law reviews in the late 1930s and 1940s. As the first half of the twentieth century came to a close, law schools published only six specialized reviews that remain in print today.

B. *The Explosion*

Fueled in part by a "second wave" of generalist law review criticism, specialized law reviews literally exploded onto the scene after the turn of the half-century.²⁶ During this second wave of criticism, a number of legal scholars expressed renewed concerns about the plethora of generalist reviews. John Cribbet, for instance, complained that law reviews were too similar to one another and that "experimentation" was needed,²⁷ while Arthur Miller criticized the "monotonous uniformity" of the reviews.²⁸ Other scholars expressed concern about student editing of the generalist reviews. Alan Mewett, for instance, argued that law students had "no place on a law review."²⁹ Still other scholars criticized the elitism of the generalist reviews, openly wondering "why, if law review experience was so pedagogically and professionally valuable, it should be limited to that small number of law school students who received high first-year grades."³⁰

sition of the law as it is, the *Review* will not be unmindful of the need for improvement in both substance and procedure. Hence it will not be exclusively or narrowly legal, but each issue is proposed to include at least one article looking toward a philosophy of tax law and practice.").

25. David F. Cavers, *New Fields for the Legal Periodical*, 23 VA. L. REV. 1, 12 (1936).

26. See Hibbitts, *supra* note 5, at 636-68.

27. John E. Cribbet, *Experimentation in the Law Reviews*, 5 J. LEGAL EDUC. 72, 81 (1952).

28. Arthur S. Miller, *A Modest Proposal for Changing Law Review Formats*, 8 J. LEGAL EDUC. 89, 89 (1955).

29. Alan W. Mewett, *Reviewing the Law Reviews*, 8 J. LEGAL EDUC. 188, 190 (1955). Mewett also voiced his support for specialized law reviews in this article. See *id.* at 189. "We already have journals concerned solely with tax law, international law, comparative law, and many other topics, each with a certain and defined audience, and each with a certain and defined policy. Of these, I have no criticism—indeed, I have the highest regard for them." *Id.*

30. Hibbitts, *supra* note 5, at 635; see also Harold C. Havighurst, *Law Reviews and Legal Education*, 51 NW. U. L. REV. 22, 25 (1956) (advocating "extend[ing] the benefits of the law review training to a larger number of students").

On the heels of this second wave of generalist law review criticism, law schools began to publish specialized law reviews at an unprecedented rate, initiating nine new specialized journals in the 1950s, twenty-seven in the 1960s, sixty in the 1970s, ninety-one in the 1980s, and a stunning 137 thus far in the 1990s.³¹ Specialized law reviews have exploded onto the scene due in large part to law school expansion, law faculty needs, and law student demands.

1. Law School Expansion

The number of specialized law reviews has increased in part because the number of law schools has increased. Almost every law school publishes a generalist review.³² Because of the proliferation of generalist reviews, “the fancier schools are no longer content to publish just *one*; they put out two, three, five or six law reviews.”³³ Following the lead of the “fancier” schools, non-elite schools have begun publishing their own specialty reviews, both to keep up with elite schools and to distinguish themselves by identifying with certain specialty areas. In 1984, for instance, the University of Missouri School of Law and its Center for the Study of Dispute Resolution launched the *Missouri Journal of Dispute Resolution* (now the *Journal of Dispute Resolution*) as part of the law school’s effort to establish itself as a leader in the dispute resolution field.³⁴ Similarly, the Loyola University Chicago School of Law and its Institute for Health Law began the *Annals of Health Law* in 1992 to solidify Loyola’s reputation in health law.³⁵ Many of the law schools ranked highly in a given specialty area by *U.S. News & World Report* publish specialized journals in that area.³⁶

31. These numbers reflect only those specialized journals that published at least one issue in this decade.

32. See, e.g., Lawrence M. Friedman, *Looking Backward, Looking Forward: A Century of Legal Change*, 28 IND. L. REV. 259, 266 (1995) (“There were only a handful of law-school law reviews in 1894; in 1994, every school worth its salt has one, and a lot of schools that are not worth salt or anything else have law reviews as well.”); Miller, *supra* note 28, at 89 (“Almost every law school administration today [1955] has reached the conclusion that one of the paths to eminence lies in publication of a law review.”).

33. Friedman, *supra* note 32, at 266.

34. See Leonard L. Riskin, *Introduction*, 1 MO. J. DISP. RESOL. 1, 1 (1984); see also Dale A. Whitman, *Preface by the Dean*, 1 MO. J. DISP. RESOL. 3, 3 (1984).

35. John D. Blum, *Foreword*, 1 ANNALS OF HEALTH L. at i, i (1992) (explaining that, as an “institution sponsoring two degree programs and numerous research projects, we believed that a journal devoted to our field of study seemed a necessary endeavor for us to pursue”).

36. See *1998 Annual Guide: Best Graduate Schools*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, Mar. 2, 1998, at 80. In the dispute resolution field, for example, three law schools—Harvard, the University of Missouri, and Ohio State—publish dispute resolution journals, and each is ranked as one of the *U.S. News* top five dispute resolution programs. Seven of the 10 schools ranked as best in intellectual property law—Franklin Pierce, George Washington, California-Berkeley, John Marshall, Texas, Santa Clara, and UCLA—publish specialized

2. Law Faculty Needs

The increase in the number and size of law schools has been accompanied by a tremendous expansion of the legal academy. Law faculty members have played an instrumental role in the boom in specialized law reviews over the past few decades. First, faculty members seeking tenure, promotion, and reputation have sought additional fora in which to place their articles.³⁷ Second, faculty members have pushed for specialized journals in particular because they want places in which to publish specialized legal articles for specialized audiences.³⁸ Third, faculty members have established specialty reviews to avoid some of the perceived problems associated with generalist reviews, like student editing. Faculty have created faculty-edited reviews to provide “peer review, feedback, the guidance of experienced editors, stylistic flexibility, timely publication, and/or other advantages not generally offered by student-edited law reviews.”³⁹ Faculty have initiated, among others, the *American Journal of Legal History*, the *Supreme Court Review*, *Constitutional Com-*

reviews in intellectual property and/or technology law. Each of the schools ranked in the top 10 in international law—Harvard, New York University, Georgetown, Columbia, Yale, American, Michigan, George Washington, California-Berkeley, and Virginia—publishes a specialized international law journal. See *id.* Of course, nearly half of all law schools publish an international law review.

37. See Closen & Dzielak, *supra* note 3, at 40 (“[W]ith the need for professors to publish while on the tenure track, many law review articles are written. . . . Specialty law reviews have increased the space in which an author may find a home for his or her article.”).

38. See *id.* at 39 (noting that specialty law reviews provide a new forum for “authors of articles about obscure or specialized areas of the law [who] may have a difficult time finding a home for articles on their narrow topics,” and also serve as a reference source for practitioners in these specialized fields).

39. Hibbitts, *supra* note 5, at 652; accord Cramton, *supra* note 7, at 8 (“The recent creation and success of faculty-edited reviews represent a response to the widespread perception of legal scholars that the student-edited law review does not adequately meet all their scholarly needs.”); Richard A. Epstein, *Faculty-Edited Law Journals*, 70 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 87 (1994); Richard A. Posner, *The Decline of Law as an Autonomous Discipline, 1962-1987*, 100 HARV. L. REV. 761, 779 (1987) (“[A]s the rise of faculty-edited law journals in the past three decades attests, the focus of scholarly publication at the academic frontier is gradually shifting from student-edited to faculty-edited, faculty-refereed journals.” (footnote omitted)); David M. Richardson, *Improving the Law Review Model: A Case in Point*, 44 J. LEGAL EDUC. 6, 6 (1994). Richardson explained that the University of Florida tax faculty:

designed the *Florida Tax Review* to be a refereed, faculty-edited journal, which uses blind reviewing and which publishes a manuscript soon after acceptance. Each of these characteristics responds to a perceived inadequacy of traditional reviews, and together they describe an improved law review model that is both friendly to authors and mindful of the reasonable expectations of subscribers.

Id.; see also Christopher M. Thorne, *Preface*, 1 HARV. NEG. L. REV. at v, v-vi (1996) (noting that “by enlisting the aid of a Peer Review Board of leading scholars, we hope to set the highest standards of quality and thus define ourselves first and foremost as a scholarly journal”). But see Lawrence M. Friedman, *Law Reviews and Legal Scholarship: Some Comments*, 75 DENV. U. L. REV. 661, 665 (1998) (“Peer review, anyway, is far from perfect. Professors are not angels, and they are not unbiased. Most of them are former law review editors, after all. They can be just as trendy as their students.”).

mentary, and the *Journal of Legal Studies*, which James Lindgren recently called “the most successful new law journal in the last thirty years.”⁴⁰ Finally, many faculty have abandoned familiar doctrinal scholarship for new forms of scholarship particularly well-suited to publication in specialized reviews.⁴¹ Faculty have sought out specialized reviews to publish, for example, “substantive legal theory,”⁴² “law and” scholarship,⁴³ empirical scholarship,⁴⁴ and “outsider” scholarship.⁴⁵

3. Law Student Demands

Law students have also fueled the rise in specialized journals by demanding greater opportunities to participate in legal scholarship and to explore interests in certain specialized fields of law.⁴⁶ In re-

40. James Lindgren, *Reforming the American Law Review*, 47 STAN. L. REV. 1123, 1123 (1995).

41. Lindgren explains:

With the proliferation of new law reviews in the last thirty years, I suspect that just as much doctrinal scholarship is being published as before. What's changed is that fewer of the top professors at the top law schools are doing case-crunching. The age of the treatise writers has passed. Many of us are no longer disciples of the civil religion.

Law faculties have joined the rest of the university. Many law professors see their job as writing articles and books *about* law, rather than as writing articles and books that *are* law (secondary commentary that might be given weight when more central authorities are lacking).

Id. at 1125.

42. See, e.g., George L. Priest, *Triumphs or Failings of Modern Legal Scholarship and the Conditions of Its Production*, 63 U. COLO. L. REV. 725, 729-30 (1992) (challenging his reader to “imagine an article written principally to influence other academics,” and asserting that such articles in specialized journals and symposia are most beneficial for scholarly exchanges among academics).

43. See generally Cramton, *supra* note 7, at 9 (“Groups of legal scholars with common interests have created a large number of specialized faculty-edited journals that publish an increasing portion of the leading articles in most of the ‘law and . . .’ areas: legal history, law and economics, law and sociology, legal philosophy, and the like.”); see, e.g., Robert C. Ellickson, *The Market for ‘Law-And’ Scholarship*, 21 HARV. J.L. & PUB. POL’Y 157 (1998); Posner, *supra* note 39.

44. See, e.g., Cramton, *supra* note 7, at 9. “Empirical studies dealing with legal institutions or the legal profession also find their way increasingly into new specialized faculty-edited journals.” *Id.*

45. See, e.g., Jim C. Chen, *Something Old, Something New, Something Borrowed, Something Blue*, 58 U. CHI. L. REV. 1527, 1538 (1991) (asserting that “[f]rustration with established academia partly explains the explosion of specialty law reviews”). See generally Richard Delgado, *The Imperial Scholar: Reflections on a Review of Civil Rights Literature*, 132 U. PA. L. REV. 561 (1984) (noting the paucity of critical scholarship by minorities published and cited in the major generalist reviews); Jean Stefancic & Richard Delgado, *Outsider Scholars: The Early Stories*, 71 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 1001, 1005 (1996) (reporting results of a survey showing that “outsider” scholars previously had difficulty placing good articles in reviews).

46. The founding editors of the *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* created the *Review* because of student interest in civil liberties and civil rights research; students had already formed two separate research groups on those subjects. They proclaimed

sponse to these demands, law schools have attempted to provide the law review experience to greater numbers of students by expanding the number of journals upon which students can serve.⁴⁷ Additionally, law schools have started secondary reviews to provide students with the law review credential⁴⁸ and to provide them with in-depth exposure to a substantive area of the law.⁴⁹ Finally, law schools have started specialized reviews to address student dissatisfaction with both the hierarchy of generalist law review staffs and their editorial policies.⁵⁰

C. *The Current State of Affairs*

The explosion of specialized reviews continues unabated.⁵¹ Because of the ongoing proliferation of these journals and inadequacies in existing indices of legal periodicals, it is difficult to obtain an accurate count of the number of specialized reviews currently publishing.

To obtain as accurate a count as possible, we consulted *The Offi-*

that their journal was "to be a review of revolutionary law." The Editors, *Preface*, 1 HARV. C.R.-C.L. L. REV. at iii, iii (1966).

47. See, e.g., Closen & Dzielak, *supra* note 3, at 39; Rosenkranz, *supra* note 5, at 887-88.

48. See generally Rosenkranz, *supra* note 5, at 914-16 (noting that secondary law reviews have credential value, while also acknowledging that the credential value of generalist review membership is greater); Max Stier et al., *Law Review Usage and Suggestions for Improvement: A Survey of Attorneys, Professors, and Judges*, 44 STAN. L. REV. 1467, 1488 (1992) (finding in their survey of attorneys, professors, and judges that service on a secondary review "was considered a somewhat positive factor for an applicant" but that legal employers tend to view it as "not nearly so important as general-interest law review membership").

49. Leibman & White stated:

Two years of service on a specialty review could provide substantial and marketable exposure to a recognized area of law. Frequently, young lawyers are driven to their ultimate career specialties not by any overriding interests they bring to their first job but rather because of the client and employer imperatives they are exposed to early in their careers. How much better to have an early in-depth exposure before making a career commitment.

Leibman & White, *supra* note 4, at 419.

50. For example, the founding editors of the *Berkeley Women's Law Journal* established as their priority "to give voice to the complex and varying perspectives reflecting the legal concerns of all women, especially the women of color, lesbians, disabled women and poor women whose voices have been severely underrepresented in existing literature." *Editorial Page*, 1 BERKELEY WOMEN'S L.J. at iii, iii (1985).

51. The growth in specialized reviews has fallen far short of the growth in the law itself, however. See, e.g., John Paul Jones, *In Praise of Student-Edited Law Reviews: A Reply to Professor Dekanal*, 57 UMKC L. REV. 241, 244 (1989).

If the number of law reviews ought to vary directly with the development of the law, the explosion of new lawmaking systems and regulatory schemes at all levels, from local to international, more than justifies the increased journal population. Granted, the growth in journals has been dramatic, but the growth in the law has outstripped it by far, in the legislatures, the courts, and the bureaucratic agencies.

Id.

cial Guide to U.S. Law Schools to develop a list of the specialized reviews that law schools purported to publish.⁵² We supplemented and refined this list by examining the three most prominent indices of legal periodicals: *Index to Legal Periodicals & Books*,⁵³ *Current Law Index*,⁵⁴ and *Current Index to Legal Periodicals*.⁵⁵ Finally, we reviewed the holdings of all law libraries located in Missouri (University of Missouri, UMKC, St. Louis University, and Washington University) and added a final group of titles from these sources. Based on this methodology, we determined that law schools—on their own, with other academic departments, with interest groups, or with professional associations on a rotating or ongoing basis—are publishing 330 specialized reviews.⁵⁶

Some law schools publish more than others, of course, as reflected in Table 1. Depending upon one's point of view, the greatest contributors or offenders are the elite law schools. Harvard Law School, for example, currently publishes more specialized journals on its own than all law schools published during the first half of the century. The University of Texas, Columbia, UCLA, and California-Berkeley law schools are not far behind. Several non-elite law schools publish a significant number of specialized journals as well. Tulane publishes six, Miami publishes five, and a number of other schools, including SUNY at Buffalo, Hofstra, and Temple, publish four specialized reviews.

52. LAW SCHOOL ADMISSION COUNCIL, *supra* note 10.

53. The *Index to Legal Periodicals & Books* claims in the Prefatory Note that it covers "[l]egal periodicals and books published or edited in the United States . . . [as well as] [y]earbooks, annual institutes, and annual reviews of the work in a given field or on a given topic." See 92 INDEX TO LEGAL PERIODICALS & BOOKS at i (1999).

54. The *Current Law Index*, sponsored by the American Association of Law Libraries, claims to be "a comprehensive index to over 875 law journals from the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia and New Zealand . . . [including] academic reviews, bar association journals, specialty journals and selected journals treating allied disciplines such as criminology and accounting." See 19 CURRENT LAW INDEX at iii (1998).

55. The *Current Index to Legal Periodicals* is published weekly in both print and electronic formats. See CURRENT INDEX TO LEGAL PERIODICALS (Marion Gould Gallagher Law Library, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.) (Ellen D. Bowman ed.), available at <<http://www.lib.law.washington.edu/cilp/cilp.html>>.

56. Our count is accurate as of January 31, 1998. Since that time, law schools have mailed notices announcing the introduction of several additional specialized journals.

TABLE 1. SCHOOLS WITH MOST SPECIALIZED REVIEWS		
RANK	LAW SCHOOL	# REVIEWS
1	Harvard	11
2	Texas	10
3-tie	Columbia	9
3-tie	UCLA	9
5	California-Berkeley	8
6-tie	Chicago	6
6-tie	Georgetown	6
6-tie	Michigan	6
6-tie	New York University	6
6-tie	Tulane	6
6-tie	Virginia	6
6-tie	Yale	6

Law schools publish journals in a wide variety of specialty areas, including agricultural law, education law, immigration law, insurance law, maritime law, poverty law, Native-American law, sports law, and torts law. Certain areas, however, have received much more attention than others, namely international law, environmental law, and intellectual property and technology law, as shown in Table 2.

RANK	LEGAL SUBJECT AREA	# REV.
1	Int'l, Transnational, Comparative Law ⁵⁷	81
2	Natural Resources, Energy, Env'tl. Law	41
3	Intellectual Property and Technology Law	25
4-tie	Business and Commercial Law	17
4-tie	Women and the Law	17
4-tie	Civil Rights and Civil Liberties ⁵⁸	17
7	Art, Entertainment, and Sports Law	14
8	Law and Public Policy	12
9	Medicine and Health Law	11
10	Criminal Law	8

Because law schools publish 330 specialized reviews and because so many of the specialized reviews have only begun publishing within the past couple of decades, legal scholars possess scant information about the relative quality or status of specialized reviews. As a result, legal scholars make reading and writing decisions in the dark. We seek below to provide guidance to legal scholars regarding the relative prestige of specialized reviews.

III. RANKING METHODOLOGY

To provide legal scholars with such guidance, we set out to rank the specialized law reviews. Most scholars who have attempted to rank law reviews have done so using citation counts.⁵⁹ James Lind-

57. Thirteen journals in this category focus on international legal issues surrounding one specific subject matter: business/economics (8), criminal law (1), environmental law (2), human rights (1), and labor (1). Eight journals focus on one continent or country: Asia (3), Canada (1), Europe (3), and Mexico (1).

58. The civil rights category includes journals that focus on specific racial or ethnic groups: African Americans (2); Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (1); Chicanos, Latinos, and Hispanics (4); and Native Americans (1). Two journals in this category focus on sexual orientation and the law. Because of the number of gender law journals, we decided to present them separately.

59. See, e.g., Colleen M. Cullen & S. Randall Kalberg, *Chicago-Kent Law Review Faculty Scholarship Survey*, 70 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 1445 (1995); Wes Daniels, *Far Beyond the Law Reports: Secondary Source Citations in United States Supreme Court Opinions, October Terms 1900, 1940, and 1978*, 76 LAW LIBR. J. 1 (1983); Executive Board, *Chicago-Kent Law Review Faculty Scholarship Survey*, 65 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 195 (1989); Scott Finet, *The Most Frequently Cited Law Reviews and Legal Periodicals*, 9 LEGAL REFERENCE SERVS. Q. 227 (1989); William M. Landes & Richard A. Posner, *The Influence of Economics on Law: A*

gren and Daniel Seltzer, for instance, ranked law reviews based on the frequency with which they were cited in *Shepard's Law Review Citations* and the *Social Science Citation Index* (SSCI).⁶⁰ Similarly, in two separate articles, Louis J. Sirico, Jr., and co-authors ranked law reviews based on the frequency with which they were cited in U.S. Supreme Court opinions⁶¹ and U.S. Courts of Appeals opinions.⁶² Proponents of citation-based rankings (also called "bibliometrics") argue that such rankings provide a measure of the relative influence of law reviews on legal scholarship and courts.⁶³ Critics of citation-based rankings contend that "citation idiosyncrasies"⁶⁴ in legal scholarship render such rankings invalid measures of the prestige of the reviews.⁶⁵

Other scholars have ranked law reviews based on library usage surveys.⁶⁶ Nancy P. Johnson, for instance, ranked law reviews based on usage at the University of Illinois Law Library.⁶⁷ Proponents of usage-based rankings contend that such rankings provide a measure of the usefulness of law reviews.⁶⁸ Such rankings suffer from the obvious problem, however, that they reflect usage by patrons of a particular library only. In Johnson's study, for instance, the *Illinois Bar Journal* ranked fourth,⁶⁹ no doubt reflecting a particular interest of patrons of the University of Illinois Law Library.

Quantitative Study, 36 J.L. & ECON. 385, 416-24 (1993); James Leonard, *Seein' the Cites: A Guided Tour of Citation Patterns in Recent American Law Review Articles*, 34 ST. LOUIS U. L.J. 181 (1990); James Lindgren & Daniel Seltzer, *The Most Prolific Law Professors and Faculties*, 71 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 781 (1996); Douglas B. Maggs, *Concerning the Extent to Which the Law Review Contributes to the Development of the Law*, 3 S. CAL. L. REV. 181 (1930); Richard A. Mann, *The Use of Legal Periodicals by Courts and Journals*, 26 JURIMETRICS J. 400 (1986); Olavi Maru, *Measuring the Impact of Legal Periodicals*, 1976 AM. B. FOUND. RES. J. 227; Chester A. Newland, *Legal Periodicals and the United States Supreme Court*, 7 KAN. L. REV. 477 (1959); John Scurlock, *Scholarship and the Courts*, 32 UMKC L. REV. 228 (1964); Fred R. Shapiro, *The Most-Cited Law Review Articles Revisited*, 71 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 751 (1996); Louis J. Sirico, Jr. & Beth A. Drew, *The Citing of Law Reviews by the United States Court of Appeals: An Empirical Analysis*, 45 U. MIAMI L. REV. 1051 (1991); Louis J. Sirico, Jr. & Jeffrey B. Margulies, *The Citing of Law Reviews by the Supreme Court: An Empirical Study*, 34 UCLA L. REV. 131 (1986).

60. See Lindgren & Seltzer, *supra* note 59, at 781.

61. See Sirico & Margulies, *supra* note 59, at 131.

62. See Sirico & Drew, *supra* note 59, at 1015.

63. See Finet, *supra* note 59, at 227 ("Citation counting is not an infallible measure of the quality of formal written communication, however it serves as an objective measure of the relative impact of publications through quantitative means.").

64. Arthur Austin, *The Reliability of Citation Counts in Judgments on Promotion, Tenure, and Status*, 35 ARIZ. L. REV. 829, 831-32 (1993).

65. See, e.g., *id.* at 838-39.

66. See, e.g., Margaret A. Goldblatt, *Current Legal Periodicals: A Use Study*, 78 LAW LIBR. J. 55 (1986); Nancy P. Johnson, *Legal Periodical Usage Survey: Method and Application*, 71 LAW LIBR. J. 177 (1978); Stier et al., *supra* note 48, at 1467.

67. See Johnson, *supra* note 66.

68. See, e.g., *id.* at 177.

69. See *id.* at 179.

One scholar, Gregory Scott Crespi, has used a very different survey methodology. He ranked two categories of specialized law reviews, international and environmental law journals, based on mail surveys of experts in the fields.⁷⁰ He contends that his expert-opinion approach is justified because he is seeking to measure “relative academic reputation,” which can best be determined by obtaining the opinions of scholars within the field of interest.⁷¹ Despite this strength, however, problems associated with the expert opinion approach include limited applicability (such a ranking is possible only *within* a subject area) and response rate.

We sought to rank specialized law reviews based not on citation count, usage, or expert opinion, but on the prestige of the authors who publish articles in the reviews.⁷² We decided to use this “author-prominence”⁷³ approach for two reasons. First, the author-prominence approach reflects the common-sense intuition that the prestige of a review depends largely upon the prestige of the authors whose articles it publishes. We suspect, for example, that most reviews select articles based at least in part on the institutional affiliation of the author.⁷⁴ Second, the author-prominence approach is particularly well-suited to specialized reviews because a specialized journal’s prominence in its field should be reflected by the willingness of distinguished members of the field to publish their work there.

We decided for purposes of consistency and comparison to use the author-prominence scale developed by Robert M. Jarvis and Phyllis G. Coleman.⁷⁵ While the ideal author-prominence scale would assign an individual prestige rating to every author who has published an article in a specialized review, the obvious and insurmountable difficulty with the ideal approach is that it would be impossible to assess the individual prestige of the thousands of very different authors who have published articles in law reviews. Thus, Jarvis and Cole-

70. See generally Gregory Scott Crespi, *Ranking the Environmental Law, Natural Resources Law, and Land Use Planning Journals: A Survey of Expert Opinion*, 23 WM. & MARY ENVTL. L. & POL’Y REV. 273 (1998); Gregory Scott Crespi, *Ranking International and Comparative Law Journals: A Survey of Expert Opinion*, 31 INT’L. LAW. 869 (1997).

71. *Id.* at 880.

72. Some scholars have conducted (intentionally) humorous rankings of law reviews. See, e.g., Arthur Austin, *The Top Ten Politically Correct Law Reviews*, 1994 UTAH L. REV. 1319; Ronald L. Brown, *Rave Reviews: The Top Ten Journals of the 1990s*, 12 LEGAL REFERENCE SERVS. Q. 121 (1992).

73. Robert M. Jarvis & Phyllis G. Coleman, *Ranking Law Reviews: An Empirical Analysis Based on Author Prominence*, 39 ARIZ. L. REV. 15 (1997) (explaining the author-prominence system and its virtues).

74. See, e.g., Leo P. Martinez, *Babies, Bathwater, and Law Reviews*, 47 STAN. L. REV. 1139, 1142 (1995) (asserting that articles are often chosen “on the basis of the perceived prestige of the author”).

75. See Jarvis & Coleman, *supra* note 73, at 16.

man used job titles and institutional affiliation⁷⁶ as a proxy for individual prestige and constructed their author-prominence scale on that basis.

The Jarvis-Coleman author-prominence scale, set forth in Table 3, consists of thirty-nine categories based on occupation with one additional catch-all category. Jarvis and Coleman ranked the prestige of each occupation or institutional affiliation based on the likely renown of a person in such a position, the unusualness of such a person authoring a law review article, and the size of the population of persons in that category.⁷⁷ Their top category—U.S. President—is assigned 1000 points; the bottom category—“All others”—is assigned twenty-five points.⁷⁸ Most people who publish law review articles fall somewhere in between. For example, a U.S. Court of Appeals judge is assigned 725 points, a first-tier law professor is assigned 625 points, a second-tier law professor is assigned 475 points, and a lawyer is assigned 175 points. Thus, Judge Richard Posner of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit scores 725 points, while Stanford Law Professor Mark Kelman counts for 625 points.

RANK	DESCRIPTION OF POSITION OR TITLE	VALUE
1	U.S. President	1000
2	Leader—Major Foreign Nation	975
3	U.S. Supreme Court Justice	950
4	Major Celebrity	925
5	U.S. Vice President	900
6	U.S. Cabinet Secretary	875
7	U.S. Senator	850
8	Lawyer Celebrity	825

76. For instance, “U.S. Circuit Judge” or “Law Professor-Second Tier School.”

77. See Jarvis & Coleman, *supra* note 73, at 16 n.7 (“In deciding how many points to assign to a particular category we asked ourselves the following three questions: (1) how well known would such a person be?; (2) how likely was it that such a person would write a law review article?; and, (3) how many persons fit within the category?”).

78. Jarvis and Coleman do not explain why they chose the 25-point multiplier (multiplying each category’s position relative to the bottom of the scale by 25). Presumably, they did not believe that a one point differential between each category sufficiently distinguished between the occupations; therefore, the U.S. President should be 950 points greater than a paralegal, rather than simply 38 points (reflecting the 38 spots dividing them). Of course, as the authors note, the distinction is irrelevant as a mathematical matter. See Jarvis & Coleman, *supra* note 73, at 16 n.7.

79. *Id.* at 17-18 tbl.I.

9	Leader—Minor Foreign Nation	800
10	Minor Celebrity	775
11	State Governor	750
12	U.S. Circuit Judge	725
13	U.S. District Judge	700
14	U.S. Representative	675
15	State Supreme Court Justice	650
16	Law Professor—First-Tier School ⁸⁰	625
17	CEO—Fortune 500 Company	600
18	U.S. Government Official ⁸¹	575
19	Foreign Nation Supreme Court Justice	550
20	Partner—Top 250 Law Firm ⁸²	525
21	U.S. Bankruptcy, Immigration, or Magistrate Judge	500
22	Law Professor—Second-Tier School	475
23	Foreign National Appellate Court Judge	450
24	State Appellate Judge or State Legislator	425
25	Law Professor—Third-Tier School	400
26	Foreign Nation Trial Court Judge	375
27	State Trial Court Judge	350
28	Foreign Nation Government Official ⁸³	325
29	State Government Official	300
30	Law Professor—Fourth-Tier School	275
31	Local Government Official ⁸⁴	250

80. The tiers are those created by *U.S. News & World Report* in its 1995 annual ranking of American law schools. See *The Top 25 Law Schools*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP., Mar. 20, 1995, at 84-86. So that our results could be compared to Jarvis and Coleman's, we also used the 1995 *U.S. News & World Report* rankings.

81. Such "Government Officials" include ambassadors, agency heads, or their equivalents.

82. This category also includes general counsels at Fortune 500 companies. The "top 250" law firms are the largest law firms according to the *National Law Journal* in its annual report. See *The National Law Journal 250: Annual Survey of the Nation's Largest Law Firms*, NAT'L L.J., Oct. 9, 1995, at C5.

83. Both the "Foreign Nation" and the "State Government Official" categories include agency heads or equivalents.

84. "Local Government Official" includes a mayor or equivalent.

32	Law Professor—Fifth-Tier School ⁸⁵	225
33	Non-Law School University Professor	200
34	Lawyer (not in any other category)	175
35	Non-Lawyer Professional	150
36	Community College Professor	125
37	Ph.D. Student	100
38	J.D. Student	75
39	Paralegal	50
40	All Others	25

Jarvis and Coleman used their author-prominence scale to rank 161 generalist law reviews by coding all articles⁸⁶ published in five volumes of each review and then calculating an average score for each.⁸⁷ Their author-prominence approach, like the citation, usage, and expert-opinion approaches, as well as any other ranking approach we might devise, is far from perfect. Nevertheless, the author-prominence approach reflects our shared intuition that the prestige of a review depends, at least in part, on the prestige of the authors writing in that review. Moreover, the Jarvis-Coleman ranking of generalist reviews is highly correlated with other rankings of generalist reviews⁸⁸ and with the *U.S. News & World Report* ranking of law schools,⁸⁹ suggesting that it is a meaningful methodology for ranking law reviews.

We used the author-prominence methodology to rank 285 specialized reviews that published at least once in the 1990s.⁹⁰ We ex-

85. This category also includes law professors teaching at unaccredited or foreign schools.

86. They only included regular articles, not articles published in symposia, speeches, comments, essays, notes, or book reviews. See Jarvis & Coleman, *supra* note 73, at 16 n.6.

87. See *id.* at 9.

88. For example, the Pearson correlation coefficient between Lindgren and Seltzer's 1996 citation-based ranking of the top 40 law reviews and the Jarvis-Coleman author-prominence ranking is 0.745. See Lindgren & Seltzer, *supra* note 59, at 787 tbl.1.

89. The Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.871. The correlation between the Jarvis-Coleman ranking of generalist reviews and the *U.S. News & World Report* ranking of law schools is significant because legal scholars generally believe the prestige of a law school is a good proxy for the prestige of that school's *generalist* review.

90. We closed the period on January 31, 1998. We included four journals that are the primary review at their respective law schools, but which have been excluded from some studies of primary law journals, such as the Jarvis and Coleman study, because they have a subject-specific focus: *Delaware Journal of Corporation Law*, published by Widener Law School; *Environmental Law*, published by Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College; *Land and Water Law Review*, published by the University of Wyoming Law School; and *Journal of Family Law*, published by the University of Louisville.

cluded forty-five journals because they were published only in symposium format during the period under consideration,⁹¹ because they publish only on the Internet,⁹² or because they had not distributed their promised premiere issue prior to the completion of our data set.⁹³

We collected author information for up to five volumes of each of the 285 specialized reviews during the period from January 1990 to January 1998. If we discovered that a journal had not been published five times in the 1990s, we coded all volumes that had been released. We coded only regular, non-symposium articles published in all issues within a selected volume.⁹⁴ All told, we coded information for 1354 volumes of 285 specialized reviews.

We coded authors according to their occupation or title at the time of publication of their articles. We concluded that this was the most reasonable approach, as an author's prestige most closely correlates

91. A number of well-regarded secondary journals, such as *Duke's Law and Contemporary Problems*, the *Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics, and Public Policy*, the *Stanford Journal of Law, Business and Finance*, and the *University of Chicago Law School Roundtable*, were not included in our ranking because they were only published in symposium or proceeding form.

92. Today, there are a growing number of legal publications that can be read only by accessing the journal's Web site on the Internet. Since the first online-only law journal was published on the World Wide Web on April 10, 1995, at least eleven additional specialized law journals, most of which deal with technology-related subjects, have been released exclusively on the Internet. For a comprehensive listing of legal journals with information available over the Web, see University of Southern California's Law School and Law Library, *Legal Journals on the Web* (visited Mar. 16, 1999) <<http://www.usc.edu/dept/law-lib/legal/journals.html>>.

We included online-only journals in our descriptive statistics but did not include them in our ranking based on concerns regarding their methods of soliciting manuscripts and the nature of the works they publish. For example, online journals often disseminate legal briefs, transcripts of proceedings, panels and programs, reports and studies, news stories, and articles originally published in print sources. To the extent that legal scholarship is included, it is sometimes in "working" or "draft" form and is often much shorter and less comprehensive than traditional law review scholarship. See, e.g., *What is The Journal of Online Law*, 1995 J. ONLINE L. (visited Feb. 25, 1999) <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/jol/jol.table.html>> (explaining that the *Journal of Online Law* electronically publishes "scholarly essays [which are] different from the typical 'law review' or 'law journal' [which] emphasizes comprehensiveness, thoroughness, and reliance on detailed footnotes"). These characteristics may in fact be advantageous to online journals as they provide a truly alternative source of ideas and writings about law and legal institutions. See, e.g., *id.* (explaining that the creators of the *Journal of Online Law* "intend something different [from the traditional law review]: a journal that is shorter, more easily readable, having wider appeal"). However, these distinctions make comparisons for ranking purposes problematic. For insightful commentary on electronic publishing of legal scholarship, see Bernard J. Hibbitts, *Yesterday Once More: Skeptics, Scribes and the Demise of Law Reviews*, 30 AKRON L. REV. 267 (1996). See also Hibbitts, *supra* note 5.

93. The *Michigan Journal of Race and Law*, the *Michigan Law and Policy Review*, and the *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law*, for example, all announced the upcoming release of their first issue, but the issues were not available prior to January 31, 1998. Consequently, we include these journals in our descriptive statistics, but not in our rankings.

94. We did not include symposia, speeches, comments, essays, notes, or book reviews.

to her current occupation and, more significantly, Jarvis and Coleman assigned points to categories based in part on "how many persons fit within the category."⁹⁵ In total, we coded data on approximately 10,000 authors.

Once we coded all of the relevant information, we then calculated the average author score for each review. Once we computed the averages, we rank-ordered the specialized reviews from one to 285. We report our results below.

IV. THE RANKINGS

In Table 4, we set forth the top 100 specialized law reviews (approximately the top third of specialized reviews) using the author-prominence scale. We included a handful of journals published less than five times during the period of our study. For each such journal, we placed an asterisk after it for each volume coded.

RANK	JOURNAL NAME AND CURRENT LAW SCHOOL AFFILIATION	SCORE
1	<i>Supreme Court Review</i> , University of Chicago	542.02
2	<i>Tax Law Review</i> , NYU	454.27
3	<i>Constitutional Commentary</i> , Minnesota	441.10
4	<i>Journal of Legal Studies</i> , University of Chicago	414.20
5	<i>Journal of Corporation Law</i> , Iowa	394.93
6	<i>Connecticut Insurance Law Journal</i>	381.94
7	<i>William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal</i>	381.62
8	<i>Supreme Court Economic Review</i> ,**** George Mason ⁹⁶	371.32
9	<i>Administrative Law Journal of the American University</i>	351.61

95. Jarvis & Coleman, *supra* note 73, at 16 n.7. It is unclear whether Jarvis and Coleman also took this approach. On the one hand, they explain that "the President of the United States rates 1,000 points [in part] because . . . there is only one person in the category at any given time." *Id.* On the other hand, they note that they coded only one author, a former United States Cabinet member, as a score higher than 725, which would support the conclusion that they gave that author a U.S. Cabinet Secretary's score of 850 based on a previous position. *See id.* Unfortunately, Jarvis and Coleman do not resolve this apparent inconsistency in their piece.

96. The Law and Economics Center at Emory University published volumes one and two of the *Supreme Court Economic Review* in the early 1980s. From 1984 through 1992, the *Review* was not published. George Mason University School of Law resumed publication of the *Review* with volume three. We coded only the four volumes (volumes three through six) published in the 1990s.

10	<i>Harvard Journal on Legislation</i>	345.00
11	<i>Southern California Interdisciplinary Law Journal</i>	343.94
12	<i>American Criminal Law Review</i> , Georgetown	342.61
13	<i>Clinical Law Review</i> , NYU	332.50
14	<i>Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review</i>	330.00
15	<i>Journal of Legal Education</i> , AALS & rotating law schools ⁹⁷	327.86
16	<i>Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy</i>	325.00
17	<i>Journal of Intellectual Property</i> , Georgia	324.07
18	<i>Delaware Journal of Corporate Law</i> , Widener	317.19
19	<i>Columbia Business Law Review</i>	314.88
20	<i>Yale Journal of Law and the Humanities</i>	304.17
21	<i>Annual Review of Banking Law</i> , Boston University	302.78
22	<i>American Journal of Tax Policy</i> , Alabama	301.52
23	<i>Harvard Negotiation Law Review</i> ***	300.00
24	<i>Virginia Journal of Int'l Law</i>	299.07
25	<i>Marquette Intellectual Property Law Review</i> ***	296.88
26	<i>George Washington Journal of Int'l Law and Economics</i>	296.74
27	<i>Berkeley Women=s Law Journal</i>	295.31
28	<i>Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy</i>	294.29
29	<i>Health Matrix</i> , Case Western Reserve	292.50
30	<i>Boston University Public Interest Law Journal</i>	292.39
31	<i>Journal of Law Reform</i> , Michigan	290.48
32	<i>Georgetown Immigration Law Journal</i>	290.28
33	<i>Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies</i> , Bloomington	290.00
34	<i>Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution</i>	289.86

97. For the past five years, Erik Jensen and Jonathan Entin of the Case Western Reserve Law School edited the *Journal of Legal Education*. Currently, Kent Syverud and Don Welch, Jr., of Vanderbilt Law School are serving as editors. *JLE Editors' Recognized for Service*, AALS NEWSLETTER (AALS, Washington, D.C.), Feb. 1999, at 9.

35	<i>Cornell Int'l Law Journal</i>	289.17
36	<i>Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics</i>	284.75
37	<i>Virginia Tax Review</i>	284.58
38	<i>Michigan Journal of Gender and the Law</i>	283.82
39	<i>Yale Journal on Regulation</i>	283.20
40	<i>Texas Int'l Law Journal</i>	282.58
41-tie	<i>Columbia Journal of Gender and Law</i>	282.29
41-tie	<i>Law and Policy in Int'l Business, Georgetown</i>	282.29
43	<i>Journal of Dispute Resolution, Missouri</i>	282.03
44	<i>Yale Law and Policy Review</i>	281.58
45	<i>New York University Journal of Int'l Law and Politics</i>	280.56
46	<i>Harvard Journal of Law and Technology</i>	280.30
47	<i>Berkeley Technology Law Journal</i>	280.17
48	<i>Columbia Journal of European Law</i> ****	278.66
49	<i>Criminal Law Forum: An Int'l Journal, Rutgers-Camden</i>	276.85
50	<i>Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Northwestern</i>	275.62
51	<i>Yale Journal of Law and Feminism</i>	275.54
52-tie	<i>Columbia Journal of Environmental Law</i>	275.00
52-tie	<i>Hispanic Law Journal</i> ,*** Texas ⁹⁸	275.00
54	<i>Syracuse Journal of Int'l Law and Commerce</i>	273.21
55	<i>Harvard Human Rights Journal</i>	272.22
56	<i>Columbia Journal of Transnational Law</i>	272.14
57	<i>Texas Journal of Women and the Law</i>	271.88
58	<i>UCLA Entertainment Law Review</i>	271.67
59	<i>Energy Law Journal, Tulsa</i>	271.30
60	<i>Michigan Journal of Int'l Law</i>	270.17
61	<i>Harvard Blackletter Law Journal</i>	269.44

98. The *Hispanic Law Journal's* score is based on the prominence of only three authors, as the *Journal* published only two regular articles in its first three volumes.

62	<i>Ecology Law Quarterly</i> , California-Berkeley	268.75
63	<i>Hofstra Labor Law Journal</i>	268.59
64	<i>Hastings Constitutional Law Quarterly</i>	268.18
65	<i>Tulane Journal of Int'l and Comparative Law</i>	268.10
66	<i>Boston College Int'l Law Journal</i>	267.86
67	<i>Brooklyn Journal of Int'l Law</i>	267.39
68	<i>American Journal of Criminal Law</i> , Texas	267.19
69	<i>Temple Political and Civil Rights Law Review</i>	266.35
70	<i>Fordham Int'l Law Journal</i>	265.32
71	<i>American Journal of Legal History</i> , Temple	264.73
72	<i>Bankruptcy Developments Journal</i> , Emory	264.22
73	<i>Wisconsin Women's Law Journal</i>	264.06
74	<i>Hastings Int'l and Comparative Law Review</i>	262.80
75	<i>Review of Litigation</i> , Texas	259.76
76	<i>Family Law Quarterly</i> , Washburn	259.24
77	<i>American University Journal of Int'l Law and Policy</i>	259.17
78	<i>New York University Review of Law and Social Change</i>	258.57
79-tie	<i>Journal of Law and Policy</i> , Brooklyn	258.33
79-tie	<i>Widener Journal of Public Law</i>	258.33
81	<i>Journal of Transnational Law and Policy</i> , Florida State	257.41
82	<i>Seton Hall Constitutional Law Journal</i>	256.67
83	<i>Journal of Legislation</i> , Notre Dame	255.71
84	<i>Journal of Law and Commerce</i> , Pittsburgh	255.43
85	<i>Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law</i>	254.29
86	<i>Stanford Environmental Law Journal</i>	253.57
87	<i>Animal Law</i> ,**** Lewis and Clark	253.26
88	<i>Journal of Law and Politics</i> , Virginia	253.21
89	<i>Harvard Women's Law Journal</i>	252.94
90	<i>Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law</i>	252.50

91	<i>Journal of Asian Law</i> , Columbia	251.19
92	<i>American Journal of Jurisprudence</i> , Notre Dame	250.34
93-tie	<i>Probate Law Journal</i> , Boston University	250.00
93-tie	<i>University of Florida Journal of Law and Public Policy</i>	250.00
93-tie	<i>University of Miami Inter-American Law Review</i>	250.00
93-tie	<i>Villanova Environmental Law Journal</i>	250.00
97	<i>Fordham Urban Law Journal</i>	249.40
98	<i>Tulane European and Civil Law Forum</i>	249.14
99	<i>Stanford Journal of Int'l Law</i>	248.48
100	<i>Journal of Contemp. Health Law & Policy</i> , Catholic	248.41

Several comments regarding the top 100 specialized reviews are in order. First, specialized reviews published by the elite law schools are disproportionately represented at the top of the ranking. Specialized reviews published by Chicago (*Supreme Court Review* and *Journal of Legal Studies*), NYU (*Tax Law Review*), Minnesota (*Constitutional Commentary*), and Iowa (*Journal of Corporation Law*) lead the list.

Despite the prominence of specialized reviews published by elite law schools, a number of non-elite law schools publish prestigious reviews that appear near the top of our list. In the top twenty alone, for example, Connecticut (*Connecticut Insurance Law Journal*), George Mason (*Supreme Court Economic Review*), American University (*Administrative Law Journal of the American University*), and Georgia (*Journal of Intellectual Property*) appear.

Third, the number of faculty-selected or faculty-edited reviews appearing at or near the top of the list is impressive. Law schools publish relatively few faculty-selected or faculty-edited secondary reviews, yet nearly half of the top twenty fall into this category. In fact, the four most prestigious specialized reviews, the *Supreme Court Review*, *Constitutional Commentary*, the *Tax Law Review*, and the *Journal of Legal Studies*, are all faculty-selected and/or faculty-edited.⁹⁹

Fourth, a mind-boggling number of specialty areas appear in the

99. In celebration of the 100th anniversary of the *Harvard Law Review*, Judge Posner argued that "the focus of scholarly publication at the academic frontier is gradually shifting" to faculty-edited or faculty-selected journals, and he predicted that "the faculty-edited journals may one day control the commanding heights of advanced legal scholarship." Posner, *supra* note 39, at 779-80. Our results suggest that Judge Posner was (once again) prescient.

ranking. In the top ten alone, for instance, every journal is in a different specialty area—Supreme Court, tax, constitutional law, legal studies, corporate law, insurance, civil rights and civil liberties, economic theory, administrative law, and legislation. Throughout the top 100, forty subject areas are represented, including twenty-four journals devoted to international law, seven reviews focused on women and the law, five environmental law journals, five law and public policy journals, and four reviews each on constitutional law, criminal law, and intellectual property/technology law.

Fifth, a handful of significant specialized reviews are excluded from this ranking because they are not law school-affiliated or are published in a symposium-only format. We recognize that some of these reviews—in particular, *Law and Society Review*, *Law and Social Inquiry*, and *Law and Contemporary Problems*—would appear at the top of our ranking if they were included within the scope of our project.

Finally, because the Jarvis-Coleman author-prominence scale accords relatively low prestige to non-law school professors, specialized reviews that publish works authored primarily by scholars in other disciplines—economists, philosophers, or historians, for example—do not do well in this ranking. We recognize that some of these truly interdisciplinary or “other-disciplinary” reviews, like the *Journal of Law and Economics*, are among the most prestigious legal publications in print. We used the Jarvis-Coleman approach to ranking, which seeks to evaluate journal prestige based on the relative influence or prominence of authors in the *legal* world, and only a handful of non-lawyers have substantial cache in legal scholarship.

V. CONCLUSION

We recognize that “rankings rankle.”¹⁰⁰ We hope, however, that the rankings we report in this Article provide at least some meaningful insight into the relative prestige of the plethora of specialized reviews out there. We also hope more generally that our Article provides insight into the rather startling ascension—in number, scope, and prestige—of the specialized reviews.

100. Terry Carter, *Rankled by the Rankings*, ABA J., Mar. 1998, at 46.