

Behavioral and Brain Sciences

Instructions for Authors and Commentators

http://www.editorialmanager.com/bbs/account/BBS_ifc.pdf

Behavioral and Brain Sciences (BBS) is a unique scientific communication medium, providing the service of Open Peer Commentary for reports of significant current work in psychology, neuroscience, behavioral biology or cognitive science. If a manuscript is judged by BBS referees and editors to be appropriate for Commentary (see Criteria below), it is circulated electronically to a large number of commentators selected (with the aid of systematic bibliographic searches and e-mail Calls for Commentators) from the BBS Associateship and the worldwide biobehavioral science community, including individuals recommended by the author. If you are not a BBS Associate and wish to enquire about joining, please see the instructions for associate membership at http://www.editorialmanager.com/bbs/account/BBS_ifc.pdf

Once the Commentary stage of the process has begun, the author can no longer alter the article, but can respond formally to all commentaries accepted for publication. The target article, commentaries, and authors' responses then co-appear in BBS. (Note: Continuing Commentary submissions are no longer being accepted.)

Criteria for acceptance: To be eligible for publication, a paper should not only meet the standards of a journal such as *Psychological Review* or the *International Review of Neurobiology* in terms of conceptual rigor, empirical grounding, and clarity of style, but the author should also offer an explicit 500 word rationale for soliciting Commentary, and a list of suggested commentators (complete with e-mail addresses).

A BBS target article can be: (i) the report and discussion of empirical research that the author judges to have broader scope and implications than might be more appropriately reported in a specialty journal; (ii) an unusually significant theoretical article that formally models or systematizes a body of research; or (iii) a novel interpretation, synthesis, or critique of existing experimental or theoretical work. Occasionally, articles dealing with social or philosophical aspects of the behavioral and brain sciences will be considered.

The service of Open Peer Commentary will be primarily devoted to original unpublished manuscripts written specifically for BBS treatment. However, a recently published book whose contents meet the standards outlined above spontaneously and multiply nominated by the BBS Associateship may also be eligible for Commentary. In such a BBS Multiple Book Review, a comprehensive, article-length précis by the author is published together with the commentaries and the author's response. In special cases, Commentary will also be extended to a position paper or an already published article that deals with particularly influential or controversial research or that has itself proven to be especially important or controversial. In normal cases however, BBS submissions may not be already published (either in part or whole) or be under consideration for publication elsewhere and submission of an article is considered expressly to imply this. Multiple book reviews and previously published articles appear by invitation only. Self-nominations cannot be considered, neither can non-spontaneous (i.e. author elicited) nominations. However, the BBS Associateship and professional readership of BBS are encouraged to nominate current topics, books and authors for Commentary; e-mail bbs@bbsonline.org

In all the categories described, the decisive consideration for eligibility will be the desirability of Commentary for the submitted material. Controversiality simpliciter is not a sufficient criterion for soliciting Commentary: a paper may be controversial simply because it is wrong or weak. Nor is the mere presence of interdisciplinary aspects sufficient: general cybernetic and "organismic" disquisitions are not appropriate for BBS. Some appropriate rationales for seeking Open Peer Commentary would be that: (1) the material bears in a significant way on some current controversial issues in behavioral and brain sciences; (2) its findings substantively contradict some well-established aspects of current research and theory; (3) it criticizes the findings, practices, or principles of an accepted or influential line of work; (4) it unifies a substantial amount of disparate research; (5) it has important cross-disciplinary ramifications; (6) it introduces an innovative methodology or formalism for broader consideration; (7) it meaningfully integrates a body of brain and behavioral data; (8) it places a hitherto dissociated area of research into an evolutionary or ecological perspective; etc. In order to assure communication with potential commentators (and readers) from other BBS specialty areas, all technical terminology must be clearly defined or simplified, and specialized concepts must be fully described. In case of doubt of appropriateness for BBS Commentary, authors should submit a detailed target article proposal using the new BBS Editorial Manager site at <http://www.editorialmanager.com/bbs/>. After evaluating the proposal, the Editors will encourage or discourage formal target article submission.

A note on commentaries: The purpose of the Open Peer Commentary service is to provide a concentrated constructive interaction between author and commentators on a topic judged to be of broad significance to the biobehavioral science community. Commentators should provide substantive criticism, interpretation, and elaboration as well as any pertinent complementary or supplementary material, such as illustrations; all original data will be refereed in order to assure the archival validity of BBS commentaries. Commentaries and articles should be free of hyperbole and remarks ad hominem. Please refer to and follow exactly the BBS Instructions for Commentators at http://www.editorialmanager.com/bbs/account/BBS_ifc.pdf before submitting your invited commentary.

Style and format for target articles: Target Articles must not exceed 14,000 words (and should ordinarily be considerably shorter); commentaries should not exceed

1,000 words, excluding references. Spelling, capitalization, and punctuation should be consistent within each article and commentary and should follow the style recommended in the latest edition of *A Manual of Style*, The University of Chicago Press. It is advisable to examine a recent issue of BBS as a model.

Target articles should be submitted in MSWord format to the new Editorial Manager site at <http://www.editorialmanager.com/bbs/>. Figures should appear in the body of the text, not at the end of the paper, and should also be supplied as separate TIFF, EPS, JPEG, or GIF files. However, if your article is accepted, TIFF or EPS format will be requested for publication since printing requires resolutions of at least 1100dpi. (Please note that costs for color figure reproduction will be passed along to the author. Color printing is expensive, and authors are encouraged to find alternative methods for presentation of their argument.) Once accepted, a Call for Commentators will be sent to thousands of BBS Associates and readers. The Call letter includes a link to the pre-copyedited final draft archived publicly for potential commentators. The copyedited final draft will only be posted for the invited commentators.

Please make sure your target article file has ALL of the following in this order: Four Separate Word Counts (for the abstract, main text, references, and entire text – total + addresses etc.), an Indexable Title, Full Name(s), Institutional Address(es), E-mail Address(es) and Homepage URL(s) for all authors (where available), Short Abstract (100 words), Long Abstract (250 words), 5–10 Keywords (in alphabetical order), approx. 12,000 word Main Text (with paragraphs separated by full blank lines, not tab indents), and Alphabetical Reference List. Target article authors must also provide numbered headings and subheadings to facilitate cross-reference by commentators. Tables and figures (i.e., photographs, graphs, charts, or other artwork) should be numbered consecutively, and should appear in its appropriate location. Every table should have a title; every figure, a caption.

Endnotes and appendices should be grouped together at the end of the paper and should ideally be locally linked to in the text to facilitate the reader (and of course the referee's task). Acknowledgements should be placed at the end of the paper.

The short abstract will appear by way of an advertisement, one issue in advance of the publication issue. The long abstract will be circulated to referees and then potential commentators should the paper be accepted, and will appear with the printed article. BBS's rigorous timetable constraints (requiring the coordination of target articles, commentaries and author's responses within the publishing queue) make it extremely difficult for us to process follow-up drafts of your submission. Please make sure that the paper you submit is the carefully checked final draft to which you wish the referees to address.

Please also ensure that your submission has been proof-read by a native English speaker before submission. This, of course, greatly improves its chances at the refereeing stage.

References: Bibliographic citations in the text must include the author's last name and the date of publication and may include page references. Complete bibliographic information for each citation should be included in the list of references. Please also include and link to the WWW URL for any paper for which it exists. Examples of correct styles are: Brown (1973); (Brown 1973); Brown 1973; 1978); (Brown 1973; Jones 1976); (Brown & Jones 1978); (Brown et al. 1978). References should be in alphabetical order in the style of the following examples. Do not abbreviate journal titles:

Freeman, W. J. (1958) Distribution in time and space of prepyriform electrical activity. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 2:644–66. <http://cogprints.soton.ac.uk/abs/neuro/199806009>

Denet, D. C. (1991) Two contrasts: Folk craft versus folk science and belief versus opinion. In: *The future of folk psychology: Intentionality and cognitive science*, ed. J. D. Greenwood, pp. 26–7. Cambridge University Press. <http://cogprints.soton.ac.uk/abs/phil/199804005>

Bateson, P.P.G. & Hinde, R.A., eds. (1978) *Growing points in ethology*. Cambridge University Press.

Editing: The publishers reserve the right to edit and proof all articles and commentaries accepted for publication. Authors of target articles will be given the opportunity to review the copy-edited manuscript and page proofs. Commentators will be asked to review copy-editing only when changes have been substantial; commentators will not see proofs. Both authors and commentators should notify the editorial office of all corrections within 48 hours or approval will be assumed.

Author response to commentaries: All invited commentaries received before the deadline are only accessible to the Authors and Editors. Please note that no commentary is officially accepted until the Editor in charge has formally reviewed it and notified both the authors and the Editorial Administrator. Please refer to and follow exactly the BBS Commentary Response Instructions at http://www.editorialmanager.com/bbs/account/BBS_ifc.pdf before submitting your response.

Authors of target articles receive 50 offprints of the entire treatment, and can purchase additional copies. Commentators will also be given an opportunity to purchase offprints of the entire treatment.

In this issue

Offprints of the following forthcoming BBS treatments can be purchased for educational purposes if they are ordered well in advance. For ordering information, please write to Journals Department, Cambridge University Press, 32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473.

Sex, attachment, and the development of reproductive strategies

Marco Del Giudice

Précis of *Bayesian Rationality: The Probabilistic Approach to Human Reasoning*

Mike Oaksford and Nick Chater

To appear in Volume 32, Number 2 (2009)

The propositional nature of human associative learning

Chris J. Mitchell, *University of New South Wales*, Jan De Houwer, *Ghent University* & Peter F. Lovibond, *University of New South Wales*

Many learning theorists believe that associative learning results from the operation of a mechanism in which links are formed automatically between mental representations. We show that the evidence supports an alternative view: that associative learning is the consequence of propositional reasoning processes that cooperate with the low-level unconscious processes involved in memory retrieval and perception. We argue that this new conceptual framework allows many of the important, recent advances in associative learning theory to be retained but recast in a model that provides a firmer foundation for both immediate application and future research.

With commentary from F Baeyens, D Vansteenwegen & D Hermans; AG Baker, I Baetu & RA Murphy; T Beckers & B Vervliet; E Bliss-Moreau & L Feldman Barrett; RA Boakes; L Castro & EA Wasserman; N Chater; ME Dawson & AM Schell; DM Dwyer, M Le Pelley, DN George, M Haselgrove & RC Honey; B Gawronski & GV Bodenhausen; A Gopnik; JD Greenwood; G Hall; DA Lagnado; N Li; EJ Livesey & JA Harris; H Lyn & DM Rumbaugh; G Mandler; H Matute & MA Vadillo; IPL McLaren; JD Miles, RW Proctor & EJ Capaldi; E Marsella, TA Riddle & JA Bargh; BR Newell; R Nolan; A Olsson & A Öhman; DC Penn, PW Cheng, KJ Holyoak, JE Hummel & DJ Povinelli; NA Schmajuk & GM Kutlu; H Schultheis & H Lachnit; DR Shanks; DA Sternberg & JL McClelland; JS Uleman; JE Witnauer, GP Urcelay & RR Miller

How we know our own minds: The relationship between mindreading and metacognition

Peter Carruthers, *University of Maryland*

A number of accounts of the relationship between third-person mindreading and first-person metacognition are compared and evaluated. Three of these accounts endorse the existence of introspection for propositional attitudes, but the fourth (defended here) claims that our knowledge of our own attitudes results from turning our mindreading capacities upon ourselves. The different types of theory are developed and evaluated, and multiple lines of evidence are reviewed, including evolutionary and comparative data, evidence of confabulation when self-attributing attitudes, phenomenological evidence of "unsymbolized thinking," data from schizophrenia, and data from autism.

With commentary from ML Anderson & D Perlis; BJ Baars; C Buckner, A Shriver, S Crowley & C Allen; AC Catania; JJ Couchman, MVC Coutinho, MJ Beran & JD Smith; JSIBT Evans; C Fernyhough; B Fiala & S Nichols; K Frankish; O Friedman & AR Petrashek; M Hernik, P Fearon & P Fonagy; B Huebner & DC Dennett; RT Hurlburt; N Kornell, BL Schwartz & LK Son; P Langland-Hassan; C Lewis & JIM Carpendale; MV Lombardo, B Chakrabarti & S Baron-Cohen; RW Lurz; CM Mills & JH Danovitch; D Murphy; D Pereplyotchik; RE Petty & P Briñol; J Proust; P Robbins; P Rochat; B Wiffen & A David; D Williams, SE Lind & F Happé; A Zinck, S Loddahl & CD Frith

Among the articles to appear in forthcoming issues of BBS:

- C. J. Mitchell, J. De Houwer & P. F. Lovibond, "The propositional nature of human associative learning"
P. Carruthers, "How we know our own minds: The relationship between mindreading and metacognition"
J. Archer, "Does sexual selection explain human sex differences in aggression?"
J. Vigil, "A sociorelational framework of sex differences in the expression of emotion"

<http://www.bbsonline.org/Preprints/Mitchell-08092007/Referees>

<http://www.bbsonline.org/Preprints/Carruthers-03112008/Referees>

<http://www.bbsonline.org/Preprints/Archer-05142007/Referees>

<http://www.bbsonline.org/Preprints/Vigil-02212008/Referees>

Cambridge Journals Online

For further information about this journal please go to the journal website at:

journals.cambridge.org/bbs

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS