Editorial

It is a pleasure and an honor to be the 10th Editor of *Memory & Cognition*. I have a soft spot for this journal—I did my first review for it, have been on the editorial board for many years, and was an Associate Editor three Editors ago. *Memory & Cognition* fills an important niche, publishing interesting, high-quality articles without requiring huge numbers of experiments.

The journal is in good shape, for which I thank the previous Editors and their editorial teams, including my predecessor, Colin MacLeod. I especially thank the eight Associate Editors working with me, all of whom have been superb as we have been dealing with manuscripts beginning in January 2005.

Laura A. Carlson, *University of Notre Dame*
Tim Curran, *University of Colorado, Boulder*
Michael J. Kane, *University of North Carolina, Greensboro*
Richard L. Marsh, *University of Georgia*
Ken McRae, *University of Western Ontario*
Robin K. Morris, *University of South Carolina*
Neil W. Mulligan, *University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*
Ian Neath, *Purdue University*

In addition, the Publications Office is even more involved now as they have assumed responsibility for the administrative journal work for the new web-based system (to be used for all Psychonomic journals as new Editors come on board) and I thank the people I have worked with there, Cinnamon Nemec, Rob Sanford, and John Bellquist, as well as the staff working with them. Finally, I want to thank the many people who have reviewed submissions for the journal over the last year, including the Consulting Editors. The quality and speed of the editorial decisions depend greatly on the quality and speed of the reviews.

I am a big fan of *Memory & Cognition* and don't plan any major changes. We will be striving to continue to publish interesting, scientifically important papers that we think will have the most influence in the field. When Geoff Loftus was Editor, he wrote to the Associate Editors that we don't publish a paper just because we cannot find anything wrong with it. I want to add that we don't reject papers just because they are not perfect. I am not encouraging methodologically sloppy submissions, but I am encouraging authors to submit their most interesting, cutting-edge research. The reviewers and action editor will evaluate the overall package.

There are two other practices we will be encouraging. First, we encourage research from areas outside the usual cognitive areas if the work provides an interesting perspective or extension to cognitive research. Thus, work in developmental psychology, social psychology, and neuroscience, among other areas, might be suitable. Second, the Psychonomic Society has started a web-based archive of Norms, Stimuli, and Data, which accommodates materials associated with articles published in the Society's journals. We will encourage authors of accepted papers to archive materials that are too long for an appendix and will be of interest to the journal's readers.

We will try to make the decision process transparent and efficient. Our goal is to provide the authors with clear decision letters so that they know exactly why the decision has been made and, if a resubmission is invited, what will be necessary in order to get the paper published. Except under unusual circumstances, we will give an accept or reject decision to the original paper or the first revision. We feel that this policy allows the work to benefit from peer reviews without lengthening the process and adding burdens to the reviewers. This procedure means that it is even more important for authors to ensure that the original submissions are polished and free of error, and to make the revision their best attempt at dealing with the recommendations in the reviews and the decision letter. Our space is limited, so we will continue to require manuscripts to be no longer than they need to be. We will speed up the process by the use of the web-based system, asking for reviews within a month, and striving to get letters out soon after all the reviews are complete. Our success depends largely on the reviewers, and so far they (you) have done very well. In 2005, the mean time from submission to decision letters for new manuscripts was 59 days.

If you visit our website you may realize that the number of papers in press divided by the number of papers published in each of our eight issues per year indicates a long publication delay. The Publications Office and Publications Committee of the Psychonomic Society have agreed that this delay has become excessive and are committed to reducing it. To begin with, the 2006 issues will be larger and contain more articles. Other changes and additional help at the Publications Office will also reduce the lag. I hope that we will eventually have PDF files on the website so that researchers will not need to wait so long before they can see relevant research. Although the delay is longer than we wish, the good news in all this is that there are many good papers being submitted to the journal.

The Associate Editors and I look forward to continuing to receive high-quality papers from a wide variety of cognitive researchers, as well as fast, excellent peer reviews. Thanks in advance. Do feel free to email us at mc@psychonomic.org.

Brian H. Ross
Editor