Report and acknowledgments for the year 2013

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

The journal is supervised by a board consisting of two members of SJDM and two members of EADM, the two sponsoring societies. SJDM decided to limit terms of the board members, and appoint new ones starting now. Derek Koehler agreed to stay on. Gary McClelland stepped down and was replace by Uri Simonsohn. I think Gary for his help over the last few years. The two EADM members are Cilia Witteman and Nicolao Bonini. I should say that all the board members have been helpful in dealing with various issues that come up, such as . . .

For the first time, a paper was retracted from the journal. The story is told in the new blog, "Data Colada", started by Leif Nelson, Joe Simmons, and Uri Simonsohn: http://datacolada.org/2013/09/17/just_posting_it_works/. Another version of the story is in "Retraction watch": http://retractionwatch.com/2013/09/10/real-problems-with-retracted-shame-and-money-paper-revealed/.

Leif Nelson has agreed to serve as an associate editor. Charles Noussair has stepped down from that position in order to become co-editor of *Experimental Economics*.

New consulting editors are Tom Gilovich, Liane Young, Clintin Davis-Stober, Gideon Keren, and Paul Dolan. Pete McGraw has stepped down.

As readers of earlier reports know, we have all been concerned with the long-term sustainability of the current business model of the journal, which is 100% volunteer effort by everyone (in contrast to the more usual situation where only the authors, reviewers, and editors are volunteers). Specifically, I have been doing all aspects of production. Some day (possibly even after someone else takes over as editor) I will stop doing this. What happens then? A large step has been taken toward solving this problem. Both societies that sponsor the journal agreed to contribute up to $12,000/year ($10,000 from SJDM, $2,000 from EADM, which is in proportion to the membership). This is a commitment for the future. I do not plan to draw on it. It will pay for student assistants. This is a viable model, used by other journals, such as the *Journal of Statistical Software*.

It is also my hope that, by the time I stop doing production, authors will be able to use some alternative to Microsoft Word and LaTeX for writing. Word is not designed for the kind of communication that it is used for, and it creates many

1

unnecessary hurdles. LaTeX is what I use in production (and for my own writing), and some authors use it, but it seems to be difficult for authors who don't have any other use for a text editor. My hope is that Google Docs, or something like it, evolves to the point at which it can be used for production. If this happens, one or two part-time student assistants should be able to do what I do now.

It is also possible that we will find other sources of funding.

In December, I posted a short survey about the journal. A summary of results is at the end of this report.

Data about the journal

Our last "impact factor" from Thompson was 1.860 (2.052 for five years), greatly down from the year before, but this was also true of other journals in our field. (The previous year, everything went up.) Relative to those, we are now doing slightly better.

In Google Scholar's "Metrics", our 5-year h-index was 29. This is very good, compared to other relevant journals.

Why not put this on the front the journal's web page, as other journals do? Because these indices were designed to help libraries decide how to spend their money. For proprietary journals, this practice is sensible. For open-access journals (especially those in LOCKSS) it is not. Worse still, *authors* are evaluated by the citations of articles in journals in which they publish. This practice is worse than just invalid. It overburdens the "high impact" journals and their (volunteer) reviewers, as authors go down the pecking order rather than ask themselves which journal fits best.

The rate of submissions continues to increase. For the years 2007 through 2013, the approximate numbers of submissions per year were, respectively, 59, 77, 114, 143, 181, 216, and 243. The number of published articles is staying roughly constant: approximately 46, 49, 57, 45, 40, 58, and 60 for the seven years respectively. This does not count special issues. The median time for rejection is still one day.

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 2013:

Adrian Camillieri, Alan Schwartz, Aleksandr Sinayev, Alex Todorov, Amos Schurr, Andreas Glöckner, Andrew Meyer, Andrew Ward, Ann-Renee Blais, Antonio Rangel,

2

Ap Dijksterhuis, Arndt Bröder, Barry Schwartz, Baruch Fischhoff, Ben Newell, Bertram Malle, Beth Loftus, Bethany Weber, Brian Zikmund-Fisher, Brit Grosskopf, Burcu Gürçay, Cass Sunstein, Chris Bauman, Chris Olivola, Claudia Gonzalez Vallejo, Clintin Davis-Stober, Craig Fox, Dalia Diab, Dan Goldstein, Daniel Balliet, David Gal, David Krantz, David Tannenbaum, Derek Koehler, Do-yeong Kim, Dominic Abrams, Don Moore, Ed Royzman, Eldar Shafir, Eli Tsukayama, Elke Weber, Ellen Peters, Emre Soyer, Enrico Rubaltelli, Esther Moher, Eyal Pe'er, Fiery Cushman, Frank Yates, Gal Zauberman, Gergana Nenkov, Gideon Keren, Hal Arkes, Hal Hirschfield, Irwin Levin, James Friedrich, Jamie Napier, Jay Koehler, Jeryl Mumpower, Joerg Rieskamp, John Jost, Jongmin Kim, José Luis Pinto, Julie Van de Vyver, Karl Halvor Teigen, Katie Milkman, Kris Kirby, Liane Young, Lisa Ordoñez, Lyle Ungar, Mackenzie Glaholt, Madan Pillutla, Maggie Toplak, Mandeep Dhami, Marcel Zeelenberg, Marieke de Vries, Matthew Wilcox, Maya Bar-Hillel, Michael Kubovy, Michel Regenwetter, Mike Smithson, Mirta Galesic, Morteza Dehghani, Nancy Betz, Neda Kerimi, Nicoloa Bonini, Noel Brewer, Ola Nathan Ashby, Ola Svenson, Paul Dolan, Paul Rozin, Paul Windschitl, Pete Mc-Graw, Peter Ubel, Petter Johansson, Robin Keller, Russell Belk, Shane Frederick, Shaul Shalvi, Shawn Curley, Shu Li, Simon Blanchard, Simon Kemp, Simone Moran, Stephan Dickert, Suzanne Thompson, Tal Eyal, Tehila Kogut, Todd McElroy, Tom Gilovich, Ulrich Hoffrage, Victor Jose, Vinod Venkatraman, Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, Wandi Bruine de Bruin, Wim De Neys, Wolfgang Steinel, Xiaofei Xie, Yan SUn, Yaron Shlomi.

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.

Survey results

In December, I posted a survey on the jdm-society and eadm mailing lists. My immediate purpose was to consider possible changes in formatting and production, such as moving from two columns to one column. In general, respondents favored

3

the status-quo, so I made only one small change, making each column wider by about a millimeter, leaving slightly smaller margins. I was also worried about the use of color in graphs, which I like. Apparently that is not a problem. Very few readers who print articles lack a color printer, and even for them the colors may not be necessary.

But I did get a number of interesting comments about other things. On the question of the long-term problems raised earlier, a few comments verged on fantasy, of the form "getting people to do things" that very few can or will do, in the absence of a large budget. The best comments concerned easy things I could do in the main page of the journal, such as reversing the order of the list of issues. (Duh.) And making the search functions more obvious. (Many complaints about the absence of them, but they have been there for a while.) And several comments about citations of JDM articles. These have also been available for a long time (thanks in part to Alan Schwartz), but I discovered that RePEc (Research Papers in Economics), which index all JDM articles, provides citations in several formats. I hope this is now all clear in the main page of the journal. Further comments are welcome.

A few people wanted versions, such as epub or mobi, that they can read on a mobile device. A major advantage of these formats is that they will "reflow" to fit the size of the window they are in, even if you enlarge the font. This is good for those with visual impairments (including ones that are self-inflicted as a result of trying to read on a phone). But html reflows and allows font changes. We already have that, and it is readable on almost all mobile devices. So I do not intend to do anything about this, although I now have some idea how to do it, in case someone else wants to take it over as a personal project.

Thanks to those who responded.