

EDITORIAL

Journal of Experimental Psychology: General is a unique journal, both because it has a mandate to report broad, integrative empirical studies and because of its long history of publishing articles that have had a major impact on the field. Some of the great classics of experimental psychology have been published in *JEP: General*, including Craik and Tulving's 1975 article "Depth of Processing and the Retention of Words in Episodic Memory" and Hasher and Zacks's (1979) article "Automatic and Effortful Processes in Memory." These are among the most widely cited and influential articles in our field and serve as excellent examples of the high quality research that readers and researchers associate with the journal. And, of course, *JEP: General* inherits the mantle of the original *JEP* (prior to its division into component journals), which was the primary outlet for research in all areas of experimental psychology. I am therefore honored to have been chosen to be its editor and proud to be in the company of distinguished psychologists such as Gregory Kimble, Sam Glucksberg, Earl Hunt, and Nora Newcombe. I particularly want to highlight the work of my immediate predecessor, D. Stephen Lindsay, as well as his associate editors, Woo-kyoung Ahn and Akira Miyake, who did an excellent job of maintaining and enhancing the journal's standing. I will do my best to continue that legacy.

I have recruited three first-rate experimental psychologists as associate editors: Mara Mather of the University of Southern California, Stephen Monsell of the University of Exeter, and Gregory Murphy of New York University. Our complementary areas of expertise allow us to cover almost all of the areas that are relevant for *JEP: General*. We also have set up a top-notch editorial board with broad representation across developmental, social, cognitive, and animal psychology. We are pleased, too, that our board is diverse both ethnically and geographically.

As previous editors have emphasized, *JEP: General* is the place to publish research in experimental psychology that is theoretically significant and of interest to multiple scientific communities. Readers should be confident that any article published in *JEP: General* is potentially of interest to them as teachers, researchers, and practitioners of psychology, not only because the topic addressed is broad and integrative but also because of the high quality that can be assumed given the journal's standards for publication. It is therefore critical that manuscripts be written so they are clear and understandable. When in doubt, ask colleagues from outside your field to read your manuscript and tell you whether they can follow it. We also ask that you avoid jargon and acronyms as much as possible. This advice seems obvious, but it is surprising how many manuscripts I have received that are so full of acronyms I need to create a little cheat sheet to keep track of them. The *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* discourages the use of acronyms and unnecessary jargon, and for good reason—they seriously reduce comprehensibility.

The editorial process will be familiar to those of you who have recently submitted a manuscript to an American Psychological Association (APA) journal. APA's all-electronic system allows speedy handling of manuscripts from start to finish, and although it does impose certain constraints on users, the result should be a short turnaround time. We normally require just a couple of days to send a manuscript out for review, and we ask reviewers to take no more than a month to write up their comments. Therefore, we hope to respond to authors within 2 months, although in unusual situations we may have to take longer so as not to sacrifice quality for speed. During our team's first 8 months on the job, we have taken, on average, 51 days to respond to authors, which is within our target range and particularly impressive given that the number of submissions has increased substantially.

I would like to highlight two features of our review procedures. The main purpose of the review process is to ensure that the research meets the highest scientific standards of quality and to provide feedback so that the ideas, methods, and results are presented clearly and, if possible, elegantly. But we will not go multiple rounds of review with authors, because we do not want manuscripts to turn into a collaborative effort among authors, reviewers, and the editor, which often yields a compromise result that does not make anyone particularly happy. To that end, we will try to write action letters that make it clear whether a revision is encouraged and, if so, what aspects of the manuscript need to be changed. In general, if after the second round of review, publication of the work is still in substantial doubt, then at that point we will ask the authors to consider another publication outlet.

Second, all of us—editors, reviewers, and authors—face increasing demands on our time. We want to publish our best work as quickly as possible, and we also want to keep the demands of reviewing to a reasonable level. I therefore believe it is in everyone's interests for editors to read submissions as soon as they are received to determine whether they are appropriate for the journal. If I or my associate editors believe a

manuscript is not appropriate, it makes no sense to waste reviewers' and authors' time on a review process whose outcome is almost certain. Therefore, we will make use of triage to facilitate the process of finding a suitable match between manuscripts and journals.

I will end this editorial with a plea: When you receive an invitation from *JEP: General* to review a manuscript, please say yes! I realize you are exceptionally busy, but peer review will work only if you make reviewing a priority. As an author who might send us a manuscript, you certainly can imagine how frustrating it would be to know that it took weeks just to find three competent reviewers because so many qualified people declined to do the job. Without peer review, it is impossible for science to progress. Therefore, every time you write a review, for us or for other scientific journals, you are doing a service to the field. For that, we thank you in advance, and we look forward to reading your manuscripts and your reviews.

— Fernanda Ferreira, Editor