

Editors' Note: New Publication Policies at *Cliodynamics*

Daniel Hoyer^{1,2}, Jenny Reddish³, Peter Turchin^{3,4}

¹ *Evolution Institute*

² *George Brown College, Toronto*

³ *Complexity Science Hub, Vienna*

⁴ *University of Connecticut*

Policy Change: Single Annual Issue

Beginning with this issue (volume 12, published December 2021), *Cliodynamics: The Journal of Quantitative History and Cultural Evolution* is introducing a few significant changes to our publication policies.

The main change is that we will now publish only one volume per year, rather than two annually as before. This volume will appear in December each year. However, we intend to publish articles, reports, and some reviews throughout the year as soon as they are ready; these will then be collected along with any other completed pieces and together will form the annual volume.

This move takes advantage of the flexibility and expediency offered by online publication. We hope this will prove to be a benefit to our authors in providing more rapid publication of completed pieces, while also keeping things interesting for readers by publishing different types of articles more regularly, and by presenting at the end of a year a broad collection of engaging material.

We are also moving towards a more open review process, sharing reports between authors and reviewers, explained below.

Readers

Cliodynamics intends to publish the same high level of innovative, compelling, and engaging content as before. We will also maintain the same range of publications: original research articles, reports on cutting-edge in-progress work, reviews and review essays on significant recent works, and forums providing commentary and insight from various scholars on key issues in quantitative history and cultural evolution. We hope that this new policy will help us share more interesting work with our readers more often than before.

Corresponding author's e-mail: dhoyer@evolution-institute.org

Citation: Daniel Hoyer, Jenny Reddish, and Turchin, Peter. 2021. Editors' Note: New Publication Policies at *Cliodynamics*. *Cliodynamics* 12: Editorial 1–3.

Authors and Reviewers

These changes won't significantly affect authors. Peer-reviewers should also see few significant changes as a result of this new policy. The main difference from previous policy is that, once the piece has been formally accepted and author(s) have reviewed and approved the proof version, the piece will be published on the journal site as soon as possible.

Anyone wishing to submit work to *Cliodynamics* should still follow the procedures laid out in our [Submission Guidelines](#). Journal editors make an initial assessment of all manuscripts submitted to the journal. If the piece is deemed of sufficient scientific merit and interest, it will be sent for double-blind peer review. Editors will evaluate reviewer reports and determine whether the manuscript should be: (1) rejected and returned to the author(s); (2) accepted with minor revision; (3) accepted with major revisions; or (4) revised and resubmitted for further review. The editors and/or editorial board may provide suggestions as to how a rejected manuscript might be improved for subsequent consideration.

More Open Review Process

We are committed to developing more open, transparent publishing policies to bring *Cliodynamics* in line with current best practices (Ross-Hellauer and Görögh 2019; Schmidt et al. 2018).

To this end, we share anonymous reviewer reports and editorial feedback with authors as before, and will now commit to sharing author responses (initially anonymous) and editorial feedback with reviewers, including multiple rounds of revision and feedback where applicable. By this, we hope to increase transparency in the full process from submission, peer review, editorial feedback, author response, and editorial decisions while maintaining confidentiality and limiting bias in the review and editorial decision process.

For now, we are not going to make peer reviews available to all readers or unblind reviewers from authors, in-line with the current policies of our institutional host, the University of California network's eScholarship system. Along with other journals, we have been in discussions with eScholarship about ways to facilitate such open review publishing moving forward.

As we work towards implementing new policies and keeping *Cliodynamics* at the vanguard of academic publishing, we would greatly appreciate any feedback from our readers, authors (past or prospective), and reviewers on the pros and cons of such open reviewing. Email us at jclio.editor@gmail.com; we look forward to hearing from you!

A Note on Recent Issues

Disruptions from the COVID-19 Pandemic

The two issues in volume 11 (Spring and Winter 2020) as well as the current offering, Volume 12, contain an unusually small number of pieces. From early 2020 to the present, it has proven difficult to find suitable reviewers for submitted manuscripts. Further, we have received fewer submissions than in previous years, and authors have been relatively slow in responding to feedback and providing revisions.

We attribute all of this to the disruptions – in schedules, in workplans, to routines – and to the social, physical, and emotional toll of the COVID-19 pandemic. We completely understand and sympathize with these difficulties and have tried to be as accommodating as possible. As a result, we have not been able to offer as wide a range of studies in the last few years as we would like. Thankfully, the level of scholarship in the pieces we have been able to publish remains exceptional.

We expect that our workload will begin to return to a more normal pace in the near future. Until then, we ask for patience from our readers, authors, and reviewers and thank all for your understanding and continued support for *Cliodynamics*.

References

- Ross-Hellauer, Tony, and Edit Görögh. 2019. "Guidelines for Open Peer Review Implementation." *Research Integrity and Peer Review* 4 (1): 4. doi: 10.1186/s41073-019-0063-9.
- Schmidt, Birgit, Tony Ross-Hellauer, Xenia van Edig, and Elizabeth C Moylan. 2018. "Ten Considerations for Open Peer Review." *F1000Research* 7 (June): 969. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.15334.1.