Review Process

Except where otherwise noted, all papers were reviewed using a process commonly known as double-blind (that is, with author and affiliation information) by between 6 and 10 external reviewers. The reviewers did not know the identity of the authors nor the authors of the reviewers. Reviewers were matched to papers using a formula to minimize the psychological distance between reviewers’ stated expertise and interest and the topics covered in the paper. In cases where this formula did not provide at least 6 reviewers, reviewers were randomly assigned to papers. No reviewer was required to review more than 3 papers.

Reviewers were instructed to mentor the submission’s authors by providing feedback on how to improve the submission. They were further required to recommend whether or not the paper should be accepted using a six-point scale (from “reject” to “must accept”).

The authors of all papers, whether accepted or not, were provided with the reviewers’ feedback as part of our process of mentoring authors. Authors of accepted papers were required to revise their submissions in light of the issues raised in the reviews.

We believe that the papers in this journal represent a great contribution to science.