Acknowledgments and report for the year 2011

Jonathan Baron, Editor

Here is the annual report. I welcome suggestions and questions, including those concerning issues not mentioned here.

News

Last year saw the completion of two special issues. The first, concerning recognition processes in judgment (e.g., “the recognition heuristic”), was edited by Julian Marewski, Rüdiger Pohl, and Oliver Vitouch, and was spread over three issues of the journal (5.4, 6.1, 6.5). The second, on methodology, was edited by Andreas Glöckner and Ben Hilbig, and was one issue (6.8). Because of the demands of these issues on my time, we had only 5 regular issues instead of the usual 6. What would have been the 6th regular issue was moved from December to January, so now we are on a new schedule, with regular issues in January, March, May, July, September, and November. In other words, the schedule lost a month.

We will have no more special issues while I am sole editor.

Authors seem happy to comply with the new (non-absolute) requirement that data be included with articles. I hope that this practice is helpful not only as a nudge to help maintain high standards of data analysis but also as a tool for the teaching of statistics with real data.

I am hoping that Rachel Croson returns as associate editor when her term at N.S.F. is finished later this year. In the meantime, we have one additional associate editor, Michael DeKay.

Data about the journal

Our last “impact factor” from Thompson was 1.632 (1.790 for five years), slightly up from the year before.

The rate of submissions continues to increase. For the years 2007 through 2011, the approximate numbers of submissions per year were, respectively, 59, 77, 114, 143, and 181. The number of published articles is staying roughly constant: approximately 46, 49, 57, 45, and 40 for the five years respectively. This does not count special issues, and the lower number in 2011 was the result of 5 regular issues instead of 6. The median time for rejection is still one day, but, sadly, my impression is that we are rejecting more articles after review, or else it takes me longer to reject them myself. This is the result of difficulty keeping up with the increased rate of submissions.
To repeat what I said last year, which is still true: The success of the journal has brought more work. We will need to add board members who are eager to do reviews, perhaps add associate editors, and perhaps increase the number of editors (from 1 to 2). But none of this is urgent.

Thanks

This journal is a complete volunteer effort. Reviewers and board members have been extremely cooperative and prompt in processing articles. I would like to thank everyone and hope that the quality and speed continue. The following (in addition to the associate editors) reviewed articles (roughly) in 2011:

Technical stuff

I remain indebted to the many writers of the open-source software that make the production process possible and sometimes even fun: \LaTeX, OpenOffice, Emacs, Firefox, Perl, Linux, R, other GNU software, and especially Writer2LaTeX (which extracts papers from the clutches of Microsoft), and Hevea (which makes the html versions with almost no extra effort on my part).

Recently more authors have been submitting articles in text format with \LaTeX formatting, which makes it easier for me. I still have problems with authors following the technical guidelines for word processing documents, and I have begun to enforce these more rigorously, even if it means delaying an article by two months.