

Report and acknowledgments for the year 2016

Jonathan Baron, Editor

Here is the annual report for *Judgment and Decision Making*. I welcome suggestions and questions, including those concerning issues not mentioned here.

News

Catherine Eckel moved from being Associate Editor to Consulting Editor. Andrew Gelman has agreed to be a Consulting Editor.

Data about the journal

The rate of submissions is slightly increasing. For the years 2007 through 2016, the approximate numbers of submissions per year were, respectively, 59, 77, 114, 143, 181, 216, 243, 249, 253, and 277. The number of published articles is staying roughly constant: approximately 46, 49, 57, 45, 40, 58, 60, 47, 56, and 52 for the same years (excluding special issues).

For the last 6 years, the number of articles rejected on the day of submission was 9, 45, 59, 68, 128, 110, and 125. (And in 2016, 16 more were rejected the next day.) Thus, about half of the submissions are rejected nearly immediately, and, of those that remain, about 40% will eventually get published.

I have decided not to include the “impact factor” in this report anymore. Anyone interested can look it up. It was designed to help libraries decide which subscriptions are worth paying for. This journal is free, so that is not an issue. The impact factor is mis-applied when it is used to evaluate the work of scholars. Instead of reading the work, asking experts to read it, or looking for what people say about it, evaluators rely on the mean number of citations of other articles in the journals in which it is published. Of course, this gives an advantage to papers published in journals in larger fields, or journals that reject papers that contribute to knowledge but are outside of current fashions. The impact factor as a way of evaluating scholars is noisy at best, misleading at worst. I do not want to encourage its use anymore.

For what it is worth, articles from *Judgment and Decision Making* continue to be cited at about the same rate as those from the most similar journal, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*. The respective h5 indices from Google Scholar, as of January 30, 2017, are 31 and 27. The new journal *Decision*, also fairly similar, is still less than 5 years old.

Thanks

The journal depends on the help of many people. 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 2016:

Alix Barasch, Andreas Ortmann, Andrew R. Smith, Antonio J. Morales, Anuj Shah, Arndt Bröder, Barbara Summers, Ben Hilbig, Brandon Turner, Burcu Gürçay, Chelsea Helion, Craig Fox, Dafina Petrova, Dan Goldstein, Dan Simon, Daniel Bartels, Daniel Heck, Darío Trujano Ochoa, Dave Hardisty, David Mandel, Deborah Small, Don Moore, Eldad Yechiam, Ellen Peters, Emily Wasserman, Emre Soyer, Eric Altmann, Eric Johnson, Eva Chen, Eyal Zamir, Ezra Markowitz, Fabio del Missier, Gideon Keren, Gidon Felsen, Hal Arkes, Iddo Erev, Ina Grau, Ingmar Franken, Irwin Levin, Islas Farias,, Jack Soll, Jaime Osvaldo, Jakub Traczyk, Jamie Lien, Jan Müller-Dethard, Janelle Gornick, Janice Nadler, Jared Piazza, Jason Dana, Jean-François Bonnefon, Jeffrey Chrabaszcz, Jesse Graham, Jesus Manuel Villarreal Ulloa, Jinan Allan, Joanna Sterling, Johanna Mollerstrom, John Opfer, John Smigh, Joshua Kertzer, Juin Kuan Chong, Julie Irwin, Justin Landy, Kathleen Galotti, Kris Kirby, Kristin Deppe, Liane Young, Lina Maria Restropo Plaza, Linda Lai, Lisa Ordóñez, Lucius Caviola, Michał Bialek, Martin Weber, Mary Steffel, Maya Bar-Hillel, Michael Lee, Mirta Galesic, Nadav Klein, Nadira Faber, Natalie Gold, Nathan Novemsky, Netta Barak-Corren, Niels van Doesum, Olga Stavrova, Paul Rozin, Peter Moffat, Phil Tetlock, Rick Larrick, Robert Böhm, Robert Böhm, Roi Zultan,, Sabine Bernard, Sandra Schneider, Shahar Ayal, Shai Davidai, Shane Frederick, Shane Mueller, Shu Li, Simon Kemp, Stephen Garcia, Susann Fiedler, Tehila Kogut, Ulrich Hoffrage, Uta Frith, Wandi Bruine de Bruin, Wolfgang Gaissmaier, Xiaofei Xie, Štěpán Bahník.

Technical stuff

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).

Recently more authors have been submitting articles in text format with \LaTeX formatting, which makes it easier for me. I still have problems with authors following the technical guidelines for word processing documents, and I am enforcing these more rigorously, even if it means delaying an article by two months.

I still cannot understand why journals with author charges need to charge as

much as they do. I think they must waste money. Although this journal now has \$12,000 available each year for assistance, I have not been using even half of that. If my own time spent on production were reimbursed at the hourly rate of my last salary (assuming a 40-hour work week), the total for that would be about \$9,000. In theory, the journal should be close to sustainable under the current arrangements. Things should get better as open-access tools, such as Overleaf, improve further; some authors are now using Overleaf.