Editorial

David W. Loring¹ · Stephen C. Bowden²

Published online: 26 January 2016
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2016

Neuropsychology Review was established under the Editorial leadership of Gerald Goldstein in 1990, and has subsequently been ably managed through the Editorial guidance of Antonio Puente, Ronald M. Lazar and Edith V. Sullivan. Although the specific content of the reviews published to some extent reflect the training and research interests of each Editor, *Neuropsychology Review* has remained committed to publishing comprehensive and integrative reviews across a range of brain-behavior relationships reflected by the broader meaning of neuropsychology, not restricted purely to psychological assessment and testing. As incoming Editors-in-Chief, we intend to continue this tradition of publishing high quality reviews across the spectrum of clinical and more basic aspects of brain-behavior relations, a custom that includes the increasing integration of neuropsychology with new and emerging technologies such as genetics, imaging, neurophysiology or clinical disease biomarkers. To help achieve these overarching goals, we are pleased to have the guidance of a broad and diverse panel of distinguished colleagues from across the global neuropsychology community as Associate Editors and members of our Editorial Board.

Manuscripts published in the March, 2016 issue were accepted for publication under the Editorship of Dr. Edith Sullivan. Except where otherwise noted, we will be assuming editorial responsibility for manuscripts published from the June, 2016 issue of *Neuropsychology Review*.

✉ David W. Loring
dloring@emory.edu

✉ Stephen C. Bowden
sbowden@unimelb.edu.au

¹ Departments of Neurology and Pediatrics, Emory University Brain Health Center, 12 Executive Park, Room 285, Atlanta, GA 30329, USA

² Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences, University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

While high quality reviews have always been the *raison d'être* of the journal, as Editors-in-Chief, we share a common goal of increasing the reporting rigor in *Neuropsychology Review* and, in particular, will seek to publish systematic reviews and meta-analytic reports whenever appropriate. This approach permits increased quantitative precision by requiring reviews to be more comprehensive and less selective than traditional narrative reviews, and keeps neuropsychology on the forefront of clear and transparent research reporting.

We would like *Neuropsychology Review* to become the first destination of choice for authors wishing to publish a high quality systematic review and meta-analysis in neuropsychology. We encourage submission of review articles on topics across the spectrum of clinical and experimental neuropsychology. While we will still consider narrative reviews for publication, authors of narrative reviews should explain in their manuscript why a systematic review or meta-analysis was not considered appropriate for their review topic.

Commencing 2016, *Neuropsychology Review* will require adherence to PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews and meta-analyses, to improve reporting accuracy and transparency (<http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/prisma/>). Part of the EQUATOR network, the PRISMA guidelines website contains extensive information for authors and is particularly relevant to systematic reviews of treatment and intervention studies, as well as systematic reviews of diagnostic validity. In addition to their systematic review, authors will be asked to submit a completed PRISMA checklist to assist with the review process.

For those who are interested in synthesizing clinical research focusing on assessment and interventions, our aspiration is that *Neuropsychology Review* becomes the best repository of reviews establishing the evidence base of the discipline of Clinical Neuropsychology to help

guide clinical practice. In addition, systematic reviews that more broadly integrate brain-behavior relationships across different experimental methods will provide important contribution to the evidence base of contemporary clinical neuroscience. While we recognize that adherence to formal reporting standards will require many

authors to acquire skills beyond those learned during their graduate education, *Neuropsychology Review* follows the lead of major medical and neuroscience journals by formally adopting standards that will facilitate critical appraisal, and hence usefulness, of published critical reviews.