# Acknowledgments and report, February 2010

**Jonathan Baron, Editor**

## Basic statistics

Here are some approximate statistics for acceptance and rejection by year of submission, excluding special issues. "Limbo" means that the the paper is under review or was returned to the author for revisions and the author has not yet responded.

| Year | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accepted | 32 | 37 | 42 | 37 |
| Rejected | 36 | 22 | 34 | 49 |
| Limbo | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 |
| Total submitted | 68 | 59 | 77 | 108 |

The publication lag is typically quite short. Beginning in March 2007, article numbers (as reflected in the links to them) are codes representing the date of submission. For example, 7308 is the paper submitted on March 8, 2007. Sometimes reviews are slow in coming, and sometimes authors take a long time to respond to them. I have not bothered to calculate the various times involved in these stages.

Median rejection time is still one day. Unfortunately, more papers are being rejected after review. This is something I try to avoid — both to save reviewers the task of reading papers that will be useless to them and to save authors the pain of rejection after long delays. But the increased number of submissions means that I cannot always read papers as carefully as I used to before sending them for review, and sometimes I miss fatal flaws that reviewers find. Also, again as the result of increased submissions, I am making less of an effort to "salvage" papers that seem to me to be marginal in their contribution.

## Recognition

I am often asked about citations of articles. I have decided to leave to others the task of looking up or computing the impact factor. The idea of evaluating journals by average citations per article seems to me to create the wrong incentives for editors. Important articles sometimes are predictably un-cited, and many articles are cited because they are both poor and fashionable (hence widely attacked). To take one example of the former, I chose the article by Sean Curley (in Vol. 2, No. 5) on the Dempster-Shafer theory to be the lead article in its issue, because I thought it was one of very few papers to ask anything about the psychological reality of this



https://doi.org/10.1017/S1930297500001972 Published online by Cambridge University Press

theory (which has been widely influential at least in computer science). The paper has been cited only once so far (by a computer scientist). Few others in the field of judgment and decision making seem to be interested in this topic at the moment, but that does not make the paper any less important in the field's long-term history.

None the less, people do want some information, so I will provide a measure that to me seems a little better than average citation rate. I will report the H index[1] (by year, as of Feb. 21, 2010, for all articles including special issues), which seems to me to be a reasonable measure of what might be called "visibility". That is not the ultimate goal, but invisible journals are not sustainable. The H index is sometimes used to measure the productivity of scientists. For comparison, I will use the *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, which publishes a similar range of articles (although fewer of them after 2006) and is thus of interest to a similar group of scholars. The upshot is that articles in JDM are getting cited in a way that is similar to other articles in the field.

| Year | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| JDM H index | 7 | 8 | 10 | 4 |
| JBDM H index | 11 | 7 | 7 | 4 |

## Thanks

This journal is a complete volunteer effort. Reviewers and board members have been extremely cooperative and prompt in processing articles. I would like to thank everyone and hope that the quality and speed continue. The following reviewed articles (roughly) in 2009:

Adam Goodie, Alan Schwartz, Angela Smith, Anthony Bishara, Arndt Bröder, Arthur Elstein, Barry Schwartz, Ben Hilbig, Ben Newell, Bruce Burns, Bud Fennema, Chris Hsee, Chris Marino, Christoph Ungemach, Claudia Gonzalez-Vallejo, Craig Fox, Dan Simon, Daniel Gottlieb, Daniel Kahneman, David Holtgrave, David Silvera, David Weiss, Dhaval Dave, Eduard Brandstätter, Edward Cokely, Edward McCaffery, Eli Tsukayama, Elke Weber, Ellen Peters, Enrico Rubaltelli, Erte Xiao, Eunice Kim, Ewa Szymanska, Felix Acker, Gaelle Villejoubert, George Wu, Gerd Gigerenzer, Greg Barron, Gregory Fischer, Hal Arkes, Han Bleichrodt, Helena Szrek, Ido Erev, Ilan Yaniv, Irwin Levin, Jason Dana, Jay Koehler, Jay Schulkin, Jennifer Lerner, Joe Johnson, John C. Pettibone, John Payne, Jon Haidt,

[1] Using the tool at http://interaction.lille.inria.fr/ roussel/projects/scholarindex/. See the Wikipedia article for details. That article points to other indices, but I think that the H index is best for the current purpose.

José Luis Pinto Prades, Julie Downs, Justin Rao, Kathleen Mosier, Kirstin Appelt, Liat Hadar, Mandeep Dhami, Margaret Meloy, Maya Bar-Hillel, Max Bazerman, Michael Birnbaum, Michael Doherty, Michael Dougherty, Michael Schulte-Mecklenbeck, Min Gong, Nathaniel Phillips, Neil Dawson, Neil Stewart, Nick Sevdalis, Nigel Harvey, Noel Brewer, Pablo Branas-Garza, Peter Ayton, Peter Juslin, Peter McGraw, Peter Ubel, Philip Tetlock, Rafal Bogacz, Ray Nickerson, Rebecca Ratner, Rex Brown, Rick Antle, Rob Hamm, Robert Wigton, Robin Hau, Robyn Dawes, Roger Ratcliff, Sam Bond, Shane Frederick, Sherri Li, Simon Kemp, Stephan Bartke, Tehila Kogut, Terry Elrod, Tim Pleskac, Timothy Brown, Todd McElroy, Todd Thorsteinson, Tom Tape, Ulrich Hoffrage, Uri Simonsohn, Xinli Wang, Yoav Ganzach, Yoella Bereby-Meyer.

I 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 on my part).