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Here is the annual report for *Judgment and Decision Making*. We welcome suggestions and questions, including those concerning issues not mentioned here.

**News**

New Associate Editors: Shane Frederick David Mandel, Sandra Schneider, Erin Krupka, Kimmo Eriksson, Ganna Pogrebna

New Consulting Editors: Valerio Capraro, Yaniv Hanoch, Adil Saribay

Retiring Consulting Editor: Irwin Levin

Change of supervisory board:
New members: Ido Erev, Gaëlle Vallée-Tourangeau, Chris Hsee
Retiring members: Ellen Peters, Tim Pleskac, Michel Handgraaf
Continuing member and chair: Derek Koehler

**New paper formats, and pre-registration**

Aside from the standard article submissions, the journal also accepts registered reports and encourages the submission of a new format of theory papers. We received several submissions for pre-registered reports in the last years. Five pre-registered reports have been first-stage accepted (i.e. in principle acceptance of the research paper before data collection) of which three are still in the stage of data collection, two have been finally accepted for publication (Frey, in press; Zgonnikov et al., 2019). The reviewers’ feedback allowed the authors to improve the design prior to data collection and to publish single-study papers, so that research became more efficient.

Researchers are still invited to submit papers or proposals in the new format theory papers (as described in our web site), by now the resonance has been low and the few papers and proposals did not reach the threshold for further consideration.

Aside from registered reports, an increasing number of submissions involves pre-registration of hypotheses and methods. Pre-registrations may be checked in the review process, and authors should take care that tests for all pre-registered hypotheses are reported in the paper.


### Data about the journal

Last year I thought that the “rate of submissions has leveled off” and tried to explain it. It turns out that that conclusion was based on a fluke. The following plot shows the continuing trend (to the point of becoming a burden), along with our nearly constant rate of publishing.

![Graph showing submissions and published articles over years](image_url)

For what it is worth, articles from *Judgment and Decision Making* continue to be cited at about the same rate as those from the most similar journal, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, according to Google Scholar. The respective h5 indices, as of January 28, 2019, are 30 and 29, respectively. The impact factor (Web of Science) of Judgment and Decision Making for 2018 was 2.253, which was higher than Journal of Behavioral Decision Making (1.791) and somewhat lower than Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes (2.908).

JDM now has an A rating from the [Australian Business Deans Council](https://www.abdc.edu.au/). (We don’t know if this is a change, but some people have asked about it.)
Thanks

The journal depends on the help of many people. Reviewers and board members have been extremely cooperative and prompt in processing articles. We would like to thank everyone and hope that the quality and speed continue. The following reviewed articles (roughly) in 2019:


Technical stuff

Some day, I (JB) will be unable to do the production, as I do now. A long term solution would involve putting more of the burden on authors. We are not the only journal with open-access and no article processing charge (APC), but all the others I know of require LATEX submission, or Word submission with (sometimes implicit) limitations on figures and tables. (Much of my production time is dealing with figures and tables.)
Recently more authors have been submitting articles in with \LaTeX{} formatting, using our \LaTeX{} template. Richard Anderson extensively updated the Word template, which now makes that much more useful to authors and to me, by helping authors avoid problems that cause trouble (usually an excess of formatting). I have been enforcing the technical standards more rigorously.

We 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).