

Comment Policy

Commentary on articles published in the journal makes a scientific contribution when it (a) brings to light critical controversies, (b) identifies important misconceptions or errors of inference, and/or (c) clarifies the implications of findings. Decisions about whether to publish occasional commentaries in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* have been guided more by tradition than by an explicit editorial policy. With the encouragement of the APA Publications and Communications Board, I have formulated a comment policy for the journal. There are two types of comments that the journal will consider for publication.

The first type of comment will continue to follow the traditional model. An article will be published. One or more commentators will take issue with an aspect of the research that bears directly on its substantive contribution. The comments will be submitted to the journal as regular submissions and will go through our review process. These comments will be judged as to whether they make a meaningful substantive contribution. That standard is the same one applied to all submissions, and it is a high one.¹ If the comment surpasses this standard, it will be published in accordance with its position in the publication queue. Authors of the article on which the comment is based may seek to publish a response. Their effort will follow exactly the same review process that the comment did. This type of scientific dialogue unfolds over lengthy time frames (e.g., comment: Schmidt & Hunter, 1989; replies: Kozlowski & Hattrup, 1992; James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1993; comment: Bandura & Locke, 2003; reply: Vancouver, 2005). In instances where the Editor believes that a dialogue with the authors of the article is warranted, he or she may solicit a reply to be published simultaneously with the comment.

The second type of comment process is intended to sharpen scientific dialogue and to eliminate the lengthy article–comment–response time lag. In this type of commentary, the Editor, in consultation with Associate Editors and/or other relevant parties, will identify a to-be-published article that has the potential to generate significant controversy and warrants timely, synchronous, and coherent treatment. Such an article will be designated a target article, and one or more proposed comments on the substance of the target article will be solicited to frame the controversy. The one or more draft proposed comments will go through peer review. If one or more comments are ultimately accepted, the authors of the target article will be invited to reply. In cases where the Editor believes that the underlying scientific issues of the controversy will benefit from a point of view beyond that provided by the authors and commentators, the Editor will seek additional commentators to provide a perspective on the entire controversy.

The target article, comments, and reply (and perspective, if applicable) will be published together in the same issue. Guidelines have been established to ensure that the commentary process does not unduly delay publication of the target article.

Comments

- Draft proposed comments will be due on a tight timeline (i.e., 2–4 weeks after solicitation), to be determined by the Editor.
- Draft proposed comments are to be submitted via the JBO portal.
- The maximum number of pages allowed is 16, all inclusive (i.e., title, abstract, text body, references, and exhibits).
- Draft proposed comments will undergo peer review.
- The review process will seek to excise innuendo, unsubstantiated speculation, and the like, which mitigate scientific contribution.
- The comment must be judged to make a scientific contribution; publication is not assured.
- Assuming reviews support publication, one round of revision with a 2- to 4-week turnaround is anticipated (to be determined by the Editor based on the extent of revision required).
- The authors will be given an opportunity to respond.

Replies

- Draft proposed replies will be due on a tight timeline (i.e., 2–4 weeks after solicitation), to be determined by the Editor.
- Draft proposed replies are to be submitted via the JBO portal.
- The maximum number of pages allowed is 8, all inclusive (i.e., title, abstract, text body, references, and exhibits).
- In cases of multiple comments, the Editor may stipulate a combined draft proposed reply (with an appropriate page limit set by the Editor).
- Draft proposed replies will undergo peer review.
- The review process will seek to excise innuendo, unsubstantiated speculation, and the like, which mitigate scientific contribution.
- The reply must be judged to make a scientific contribution; publication is not assured.
- Assuming reviews are supportive, one round of revision with a 2- to 4-week turnaround is anticipated (to be determined by the Editor based on the extent of revision required).

¹ I should note that correction of factual errors or clarifications (by authors or others) does not rise to the contribution level of a comment. These matters are resolved by publication of a one-page correction by the original authors that is then associated with the electronic version of the article.

Perspective

• If solicited, draft perspectives will follow the same process as commentaries.

The title of commentaries, responses, and perspectives must contain language that identifies the article as such (e.g., “A Comment on . . .”).

—Steve W. J. Kozlowski, Editor

References

Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 87–99. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.87

James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1993). r_{wg} : An assessment of

within-group interrater agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 306–309. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.78.2.306

Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Hattrup, K. (1992). A disagreement about within-group agreement: Disentangling issues of consistency versus consensus. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 161–167. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.77.2.161

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1989). Interrater reliability coefficients cannot be computed when only one stimulus is rated. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 368–370. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.2.368

Vancouver, J. B. (2005). The depth of history and explanation as benefit and bane for psychological control theories. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 38–52. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.38

Received February 3, 2011

Revision received February 3, 2011

Accepted February 3, 2011 ■