

Editorial

It is an honor to be chosen as Editor of *Psychological Review*. The journal has a long tradition spanning more than 100 years as being the primary venue for theoretical advances in psychology. My intention is to continue the high standards of excellence that have resulted in the journal's unique standing in the psychology scientific community.

I have enlisted three colleagues who are well acquainted with the journal to serve as Associate Editors. Yuko Munakata, Randy O'Reilly, and Yaacov Trope have generously agreed to give of their time to serve in this capacity, and we have also recruited an impressive group of Consulting Editors to assist us. However, we can only be effective if the reviewers that we ask to evaluate manuscripts are willing to provide informative and timely reviews. During the short time that we have been receiving manuscripts, we have appreciated the careful and timely reviews that have been provided. It should be obvious that the journal can prosper only as long as individuals in the field are willing to provide reviews.

Although the journal has always been the major outlet for theoretical work in the field, the review process for the journal has at times been rather drawn out. In many ways this is understandable because articles submitted to *Psychological Review* are usually much longer and more difficult to evaluate than straight empirical articles or literature reviews. Nevertheless, one of our major goals is to significantly reduce the turnaround time from when an author submits a manuscript until he or she receives the initial action letter. In addition, we have adopted a triage policy wherein papers will initially be screened by one of the Editors and returned unreviewed in those cases where it is obvious to us that the paper is inappropriate for the journal. Letters will be sent to authors informing them of this decision within a week of the initial submission of a paper. Although these letters may be disappointing to an author, we believe that they actually provide the author with the opportunity to receive some prompt feedback and to quickly seek a more appropriate outlet for their work. In many instances, the inappropriate papers consist of literature reviews, discussions of methodological issues, or straight empirical reports.

In addition to our goal of providing efficient and timely feedback, we also intend to maintain the tradition of publishing influential and important articles. In a graduate seminar that I taught recently, it was instructive that the key articles for all of the major content areas that we covered appeared in *Psychological Review*. My guess is that such would be true for most key areas of scientific psychology. It has simply been the case that many of the most important articles in many different areas of psychology have appeared in the pages of the journal. We intend to continue this tradition. Specifically, we are interested in papers that advance new theory and/or present new models in any area of psychology.

At times, it has appeared that some articles in *Psychological Review* are of relevance to, and understood by, a relatively small number of researchers. Another goal that we have is to strive to publish papers that have wide general appeal. Thus, if a manuscript is otherwise scientifically acceptable but would be obscure to all but a few individuals, we will ask the author to make the relevance of the work much more apparent prior to publishing the paper. We expect articles published in the journal to have broad impact. Reviewers will specifically be asked to comment on how important the work is to a wide community of psychologists and how accessible it is.

Finally, we will strive to continue to have *Psychological Review* serve as a forum for growth within the field of psychology. As such, submissions from all areas of psychology that promote new theory development are welcome and encouraged.—Keith Rayner, Editor