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Editor’s Responsibilities
The Editor is responsible for the quality production of the journal. Specific responsibilities include:

- Proactively soliciting manuscripts relevant to the purpose of the journal.
- Producing the journal in a timely manner, based on the enclosed schedules of production, to assure that the journal is delivered to ABAI members prior to the annual convention and on schedule for the fall issue, if there is one.
- Ensure that overall page count for the journal falls within specified guidelines.
- Appointing and managing the work of the editorial board.
- Overseeing the editorial process for manuscripts submitted for publication (assignment of manuscripts to self or Associate Editors who select reviewers for blind review, manage the time in which review takes place to assure that manuscript review allows for a response to authors within two months, and assure that review comments are constructive in nature; maintenance of records). Ensuring that author-identifying information is removed from electronic copies sent to reviewers.
- Overseeing the content, editing, and layout of the journal in cooperation with the Managing Editor.
- Providing an annual written report to the Publication Board Coordinator, for inclusion in the Publication Board report that is submitted April 15th each year to the ABAI Executive Council. The format of the report should follow that of the enclosed 2010 reports, and include data on:
  - Journal content
  - Timeliness of publication
  - Processing times of manuscripts
  - Editorial Personnel and Editorial Board
  - Administrative and other activities or issues
  - Budget requests
- Chair search committee (comprised of Publication Board members) for Editor when term expires.
# Production Schedule Target Dates for Two Issues per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPRING</th>
<th>FALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic version</td>
<td>Dec 1</td>
<td>Aug 2 for a Fall issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of papers, and Table of Contents received by Managing Editor (ME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing company posts proofs</td>
<td>Dec 16</td>
<td>Aug 17 (if Fall issue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME sends filler needs to ABAI</td>
<td>Dec 23</td>
<td>Aug 31 (Fall issue only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAI sends fillers to ME</td>
<td>Jan 3</td>
<td>Sept 7 (Fall issue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All authors’ proofs returned to ME</td>
<td>Jan 6</td>
<td>Sept 8 (Fall issue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Company posts revised proofs</td>
<td>Jan 17 (Spring)</td>
<td>Sept 20 (Fall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME receives revisions from authors</td>
<td>Jan 26</td>
<td>Sept 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing company posts second revised proof</td>
<td>Feb 2</td>
<td>Oct 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA receives final revisions from authors</td>
<td>Feb 11</td>
<td>Oct 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing list received by Printing Company</td>
<td>Mar 1</td>
<td>Nov 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue mails</td>
<td>Mar 9</td>
<td>Nov 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for Submission
1. Submissions are to be electronic, unless that is not possible. Electronic submissions should conform to all Instructions for Contributors. Please indicate the total number of pages in the manuscript and the number of figures and tables in a cover e-mail.

2. The title page of each copy should include only the full title. The author(s) name(s), address(es).

3. Provide a copy of including (a) any footnotes to the title (e.g., regarding acknowledgements), (b) the proper authorship and affiliation(s), (c) any footnote(s) to author name(s), (d) e-mail address, and (e) a list of at least four to six key words for indexing purposes.

4. You may also provide the names and addresses of three to five people outside of your institution whom you would recommend as qualified reviewers of your manuscript.

5. Authors have the option of requesting blind review. In that case, a copy of the MS stripped of identifying information should be submitted. Separate files should be sent for the manuscript proper and for Items 2–4 of these guidelines.

Editorial Review
1. All manuscripts will be considered for suitability for publication by the Editor.

2. Reviewers are selected by the editor handling the manuscript. At least two reviewers are selected, one or more from the Editorial Board and the remainder selected as guest reviewers appropriate to the manuscript. Reviewer comments will be returned with any marked manuscripts and the editorial decision within approximately two to four months.
Address manuscripts to:
Editor of journal
Editorial Policies

Synopsis of Editorial Process

The editorial process begins when an electronic copy of the complete manuscript—written in the form outlined in the current edition of the American Psychological Association Publication Manual—is submitted directly to the Editor. The manuscript is then assigned to an Action Editor (either an Associate Editor or the Editor) who is responsible for determining whether the paper is acceptable for publication and, if so, what revisions are required. Before reaching a decision, the Action Editor consults two or more reviewers. The reviewers’ primary function is to provide the author with a thorough evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the paper and to provide the Action Editor with a recommendation on the acceptability of the paper for publication. The Action Editor, in turn, has the responsibility of weighing the comments and recommendations of the reviewers as well as his or her own opinion of the manuscript, reaching a decision regarding the disposition of the manuscript, and transmitting that decision and the reviewers’ comments to the author, the manuscript reviewers, and the Editor. The Action Editor need not be “vote counter; he or she has the responsibility of making the judgment about the disposition of a manuscript.

If the manuscript is rejected, the Action Editor informs the author by letter explaining the basis for the decision. If the paper is accepted contingent on making revisions, the Action Editor notifies the author of the required revisions. On receipt and acceptance of the revised manuscript, the Action Editor then sends the paper to the Editor with a recommendation for publication.

The Editor has the final responsibility for the decision to publish the paper and for determining the issue wherein the paper will appear. The Editor is also responsible for the legal procedures associated with the transfer of copyright from the author to the journal and for those aspects of the copy-editing processes requiring professional judgments. The Editor then forwards the manuscript to the Managing Editor who prepares it for typesetting and corresponds with the author regarding changes in the page proofs.
Manuscript Received from Author Flow Chart

STEP 1
Log ms., assign ms. # (year-sequential number received), create electronic history sheet (See Sample 1)

STEP 2
Check for suitability of general content for journal

Content appropriate for journal?

NO
Return ms. to author with letter of explanation (See Sample 2); record “reject out of hand” on log & history sheet

YES

STEP 3
Check for conformity to submission guidelines (See “Instructions for Contributors”)

Guidelines followed?

NO
Communicate w/ author as necessary (e.g., to forward additional copy, mask identifying information)

YES

STEP 4
Assign to self or AE and enter name on history sheet

STEP 5
Send author copy of history sheet or letter to acknowledge receipt (See Sample 3)

STEP 6

STEP 7
Send AE request to handle ms. (see Sample 4), along with (a) electronic copy of ms., (b) author’s cover letter, (c) copy of updated reviewer workload sheet (See Sample 5), and (d) ms. history sheet

Go to MS Handling
**SAMPLE 1: History Sheet**

| The Behavior Analyst  
| Manuscript History Sheet |
| --- | --- |
| Manuscript #: | e.g., 04-11 for the 11th ms. rec’vd in 2004 |
| Author(s): |  |
| Submitting author address: |  |
| Submitting author e-mail: |  |
| MS Title: | Assign to self or other as AE depending on topic/area and current ms. load  
Establish date about 60 days after receipt of ms. |
| Date received by Editor: |  |
| Action Editor: |  |
| Date Sent to AE: | Target Date for Editorial Decision: |
| Date received by AE: |  |
| reviewers chosen | Date Out | Date Requested | Date Back |
| A |  |  |  |
| B |  |  |  |
| C |  |  |  |
| Editorial decision: | Date decision letter sent to author: |
| accepted Manuscripts: | Date Out | Date Returned |
| Revision 1 |  |  |
| Re-revision |  |  |
| Sent to Editor |  |
| Date received from AE: |  |
| Date of final acceptance letter (if accepted): |  |
| Date sent to Copy Editor: |  |
SAMPLE 2. “Reject out of hand” letters

(Step 2 in Sample 1). It is appropriate to reject a manuscript out of hand if you are certain it will not be accepted under any circumstances and the content suggests the author will not benefit from the review process. In such cases, your decision letter should point out why the manuscript is unacceptable (as in the sample letters below).

---

Dear

Thank you for your interest in having your work considered by our journal. This manuscript, however, falls outside the scope of the type of articles published by the journal. Specifically, (journal name) publishes “____ (insert description)____”, whereas your manuscript (indicate focus that differs from journal’s mission)____.

I am returning your manuscript without review so that you will not be delayed should you decide to submit it to a journal that is better suited for this type of article.

Sincerely,

(Name)
Editor

---

Dear

Thank you for your interest in having your manuscript considered by (journal name). However, because the manuscript is quite lengthy and appears to be written in a dissertation style, I do not anticipate that it would be reviewed favorably for publication as a journal article. I am therefore returning the manuscript to you. We would however, welcome the opportunity to consider a more concise manuscript, written in APA style, on the topic you’ve addressed.

Sincerely,

(Name)
Editor
SAMPLE 3: Manuscript receipt acknowledgement

Dear Dr. X,

This letter is to inform you that your paper, “(Article title)” has been received by this office and forwarded for review. Your manuscript has been assigned the number 0X-XX and has been sent to (AE name) (address below) who will serve as action editor for the paper. Correspondence about the review process should be directed to her.

Thank you for submitting your work to The Behavior Analyst.

Sincerely,

Editor

Cc: Associate Editor
   Editor’s files

Address of AE:

SAMPLE 4: Letter (or e-mail) assigning ms. to AE

Dear

Please accept editorial responsibility for the enclosed manuscript, #0X-XX, “(Article name)” by (authors). Please let me know the reviewers you have chosen by electronic mail.

All my best,

Enc: Copies of #0X-XX
   History sheet
   Reviewer load sheet
SAMPLE 5: Reviewer workload sheet

(Step 7 in Sample 2). The editorial office updates the workload sheet each time an AE notifies the Editor of reviewers selected for a manuscript, and again when the review process is completed and the editorial correspondence is sent to the Editor. The workload sheet (which the Editor sends to the AE when assigning a ms.) helps the AE to determine which reviewers to use, and provides information useful to the Editor when deciding whether or not to renew appointments to the editorial board.

Names of editorial board members are listed in the first column. A designation (see legend) is made for each manuscript assigned to that reviewer. Thus, in the example, “Ed Torial” has been sent 5 manuscripts to date. He completed the first, was more than 2 weeks late with the second, refused the third, never returned the fourth, and he has one that is due on May 20.

When guest reviewers are selected, they get added to the reviewer load sheet. It is important that refusals be documented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ed E. Torial</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>5/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: X = review completed  L = review returned > 2 weeks late  
R = review refused  NR = review not returned by decision date  
_/_ = date requested for review of ms. currently assigned
Specifics of Manuscript Handling

The following guidelines apply if you have assigned yourself as the Action Editor for a manuscript (similar procedures should be followed for manuscripts you assign to an Associate Editor).

A. Selecting Reviewers

1. Look over the manuscript and, after skimming the Board of Editor’s workload sheet, assign appropriate reviewers. In choosing reviewers, consider areas of expertise, whether or not the individual has another review pending, and reviewing history. In some cases, you may wish to use guest reviewers in addition to or in place of board members. Guest reviewers can be experienced authors or reviewers who have specialized expertise related to the topic of the manuscript. You might also want to use relatively inexperienced authors whose manuscripts you have handled, or advanced graduate students; these individuals can gain valuable experience (and their loyalty and skills cultivated) by involving them in the editorial process, but it is best to use them as supplements to rather than replacements for more experienced reviewers (i.e., as Reviewers “C” or “D”).

2. Update the manuscript history sheet with reviewer information. When assigning non-board members as reviewers, place a (G) after their names on the manuscript history sheet so they can be credited as Guest Reviewers in the journal. Before sending the manuscript to guest reviewers, it is helpful to contact them by e-mail to ascertain their willingness to provide a review within the appropriate time line.

   (AEs serving as action editors for a manuscript should immediately notify you of reviewer selections.)

3. After you have selected reviewers or have been notified of reviewer selections by the AE to whom you have assigned the manuscript, update the reviewer workload sheet (Sample 5) by entering next to the reviewers’ names the date that the review has been requested. (This will allow you and AEs to see who already has a review pending when making reviewer assignments for subsequent manuscripts.)

B. Sending Out a Manuscript for Review

1. Send the following to each reviewer you have selected:
   a. An email message requesting a review of the manuscript (see Sample 6)
   b. A copy of the manuscript (without information as to the identity of the author)
   c. If the manuscript is a revision of a previous manuscript that has been revised and re-submitted, you can decide if it would be helpful to also provide the reviewers with related material (e.g., a copy of the author’s cover letter explaining the changes made, the editorial correspondence and reviewer comments for the original manuscript). If you attach those materials, information that identifies the authors should be deleted.
SAMPLE 6: Letter (or e-mail) to reviewer

Dear

Given your expertise in the area of _______________, I would appreciate your assistance in reviewing the enclosed manuscript, “____________ (title) _______” If you are able to undertake the review, please (a) include at the top of the review the manuscript number (#____) and reviewer identification letter (Reviewer ___); (b) make an explicit recommendation to Accept, Accept pending revision, Revise and resubmit, or Reject; (c) provide a detailed evaluation of key features of the manuscript (e.g., adequacy of its presentation, methodology, conceptual analysis, etc., as appropriate), written in a style suitable for forwarding to the author; and (d) e-mail your review as an attachment to me at (e-mail address) by the return requested return date of _______. You need not return the manuscript unless you have made many comments on it that you feel would be valuable to the author(s) and that are not found in your review.

Journal policy recognizes the privileged nature of communications concerning manuscripts submitted for publication, so please delete all copies of the manuscript once you have submitted your review Please note that, as indicated in the APA Publication Manual (4th Ed., pp. 298 & 299), "authors are protected by federal statute against unauthorized use of their unpublished manuscripts…When submitting a manuscript to [a journal], an author implicitly consents to the handling necessary for review of the manuscript. However, editors and reviewers may not, without the author’s explicit permission, quote from a manuscript or circulate copies for any purpose other than that of editorial review. In addition, editors and reviewers may not use the material from an unpublished manuscript to advance their own or others’ work without the authors’ consent.

If a change in the target date would make it possible for you to complete the review, please contact me as soon as possible. If you are not able to undertake the review at this time, please return the manuscript as soon as possible so that another reviewer can be selected.

Thank you for your help!

Sincerely,
2. Date Reminder

It is useful to check on the status of reviews for the manuscript on or a few days before the date you have requested the review (see Step F1).

C. Refusal to Review—Additional Reviews

1. If a reviewer decides not to review a manuscript that has been sent, immediately re-assign the manuscript to another reviewer. Update the manuscript history sheet with this information. (An AE who is handling a manuscript should notify you of the reviewer who refused and the new reviewer assigned so that you can also update the reviewer workload sheet.)

2. Update the reviewer workload sheet by replacing the date with an “R” next to the name of the reviewer who has refused the review, and date the review has been requested by the replacement reviewer.

D. As Reviews are Returned

1. Place the review in the electronic file for the manuscript.

2. Enter on the manuscript history sheet the date you received the review.

3. When the "date received" column is filled in for each reviewer on the manuscript history sheet, or when the reviewer deadline has passed and you feel that you have obtained adequate reviewer input, you are ready to make your editorial decision.

E. Reviews Late or Not Returned

1. If you have not received the review by the requested date, send an e-mail reminder to the reviewer (see Sample 7). A prompt to confirm the date when you can expect the review is helpful when you are determining whether to write your decision letter without the late review or to wait for its receipt.

SAMPLE 7: E-mail to late reviewer

Dear

I have not received your review of Manuscript # ______ (“title “), which had a requested return date of __________. I will soon need to communicate my editorial recommendation to the author, and I would very much value your input. Would you please let me know at your earliest convenience when I can expect to receive your review? If you have already sent your review to me, it may have been delayed or lost in transmission; would you re-send it to me an attachment to (e-mail address).

Thank you for your important service on behalf of (journal name).

Sincerely,
2. Every effort should be made to communicate an editorial decision by the due date. If there is an unexpected delay, however, be sure to notify the author of the delay and the new date by which you will make your editorial decision.

3. If a review is returned long after you have made your editorial decision, mark the date received on the manuscript history sheet and forward a copy of the review to the author.

4. If the late review is returned before you make your decision, but 2 weeks after your requested return date, it is marked as "L" on the reviewer workload sheet, if the reviewer is a board member. If the review is returned after you have made your decision, it is marked as "N" on the reviewer workload sheet, if the reviewer is a board member.

F. Inappropriate Reviews

If you receive a review that you believe is inappropriate due to its tone, feel free to delete the review from the information sent to authors.
Guidelines for Manuscript Decisions

The following categories will be used for your editorial decisions:

A. Accept

Self-explanatory. Rarely will a manuscript be acceptable for publication without revision.

B. Accept with Revision

A manuscript that you determine will be acceptable contingent on specific, straightforward revisions. Manuscripts that require revisions, which, even if extensive, would not potentially affect the conclusions, may be assigned to this category.

C. Revise and Resubmit

Revise and resubmit decisions are appropriate for manuscripts that are promising and potentially acceptable, but one or more of the following conditions would preclude a commitment to accept the manuscript without additional review: These manuscripts should be coded as new submissions and given a new number.

- For the manuscript to be acceptable substantive revisions would be needed and it is not clear whether or not the needed revisions are possible. For example, data may need to be re-analyzed in a particular way, but it is questionable whether the raw data are in a form that would allow that analysis.

- The requested revisions would potentially affect or alter the conclusions. For example, a request to consider a larger sample of the literature in a review of a particular topic might yield different findings or interpretations than those originally presented.

- The requested revisions are so extensive that it is highly unlikely they could be completed within a reasonable period of time (after which the information or topic might no longer be considered current or relevant).

- The necessary revisions are likely to alter the thrust of the manuscript.

D. Reject

Self-explanatory.
Editorial Correspondence for Initial Decisions

A. Informing Authors

Send to the submitting author:

1. A letter discussing your editorial decision, summarizing the main points made by the reviewers, including the specific reasons for your decision. See sample in Appendix A.
   a. For “Accept with revision” decisions, the specific revisions required should be clearly stated to the author. It should be clear that the manuscript will be accepted if the author makes the specific revisions requested (or provides an acceptable explanation for not making specific changes). Request that the author include a cover letter with the revision describing the changes that were made in response to your suggestions. Specify a date by which the revision should be returned to you (no more than 90 days).
   b. For “Revise and resubmit” decisions, encourage the author to resubmit the manuscript if the critical problems you identify can be addressed satisfactorily. Instruct the author where to send the revision. The revision is treated as a new manuscript, and the copies should be sent to the Editor along with a cover letter indicating the original manuscript number and the action editor who handled it. Ask the author to let you know if he or she plans to revise and resubmit the manuscript.

2. A copy of each review without revealing the reviewers’ identities.

3. A copy of each manuscript or pages that have been marked by the reviewers. For “Accept with revision” or “Revise and resubmit” decisions, it is helpful for you to mark specific editorial suggestions on the manuscript. This can be done using the “tracking function” on the word processor. Usually manuscripts can be improved with respect to organization, presenting information more concisely or with greater clarity or precision. In addition, changes are frequently needed to conform to APA style.

B. Informing Reviewers

Send to the reviewers of the manuscript:

1. A note thanking the reviewer and listing the individuals who reviewed the manuscript (e.g., “For your information, Reviewer A was _______, Reviewer B was ______,” etc.)

2. A copy of your decision letter to the author

3. A copy of each review

C. Editorial Office Records

Place in the manuscript file:

1. An updated copy of the manuscript history sheet (which should now contain complete reviewer information, including when reviews were received, the initial editorial decision, and the date of the decision).

2. A copy of your decision letter to the author.

3. A copy of each review.

If an AE handled the manuscript, you should receive this information from him or her.

Update the reviewer workload sheet (e.g., change the date in the box for a reviewer’s name to an X indicating that a review was completed).
Receiving a Revision

A. For Manuscripts Accepted with Revision

The revision is sent directly to the AE (as an e-mail attachment). The following steps should be employed upon receipt of a revision from an author:

1. Record on the manuscript history sheet the date the revision was received.
2. Send the author an email acknowledgement that you have received the revision.
3. If, after reviewing the manuscript, you believe additional changes are in order, send a letter (e-mail) to the author indicating the changes needed. You can refer the author to suggestions you have marked on the manuscript using the “track changes” function of the word processor. Copy the editor on the correspondence.
4. Record on the manuscript history sheet the date you communicated with the author about additional revision.
5. Repeat the above steps as necessary (until the manuscript is ready for publication).

B. For Manuscripts Revised and Resubmitted

When the editorial decision for the original manuscript was “revise and resubmit,” the author will have been instructed to send a cover letter indicating the original manuscript number and the AE who handled it. If the manuscript was handled by a current AE, assigning the new manuscript to that AE (who is most familiar with it) can help ensure continuity. Treat the submission as a new manuscript and follow the steps previously outlined for “Manuscript received from author.”

You or the AE (whoever is handling the resubmitted manuscript) should determine whether the changes are such that the manuscript requires additional review. If it is unclear whether the revisions are adequate or the changes appear to affect the manuscript in a negative way, it is appropriate to solicit additional comments from reviewers. (You may send the manuscript to one or more of the original reviewers or to new ones.) Follow the steps previously outlined for “Specifics of manuscript handling.”

It is not necessary to have the revision reviewed if it is clear that either (a) the revision addresses the questions and concerns identified for the original manuscript (e.g., the revision satisfactorily clarifies a key point or provides information that had been missing), or (b) the authors were not responsive to the major concerns or requested revisions noted in the editorial correspondence for the original manuscript. In such cases, it is appropriate for you to handle the revision and communicate with the author accordingly without subjecting the manuscript to further review. In the former case (a), follow steps 3-5 above for “manuscripts accepted with revision.” In the latter case (b), treat the manuscript as a “reject out of hand.” Indicate on the manuscript history sheet that the manuscript was not sent out for review, and record the appropriate editorial decision. If you assigned the manuscript to an AE who handled the original submission, the AE should notify you if the manuscript is not sent out for review and of the editorial decision, and attach a copy of the letter to the author.
Final/Publishable Manuscript

1. When an AE who is handling a manuscript determines that it is ready for publication, he or she should send (e-mail) to you:
   (a) A note informing you that the manuscript (#__) is being recommended for publication.
   (b) A copy of the “acceptance recommendation” letter to the author. (See Sample 7)
   (c) Updated information on the manuscript history sheet (date revisions were requested and received, date final ms. was sent to you)
   (d) A copy of the manuscript being recommended for publication.

Sample 8. AE’s acceptance recommendation letter to author

Dear _________,

Today I forwarded your manuscript (with _________), “___(title)___” (MS #) to the Editor with my recommendation for publication. The Editor will inform you of the final editorial decision, and if any additional changes are needed. If the Editor determines that the manuscript is acceptable, s/he will initiate formal procedures for publication in ___(journal)___ and notify you about page proofs and reprints. Future correspondence about the manuscript should be addressed to him/her.

Thank you again for submitting the article. (Insert complimentary statement about contribution of the manuscript)

Sincerely,

2. Once you receive the acceptance materials from the AE:
   (a) Send (e-mail) acknowledgement of receipt to the AE
   (b) When you have reviewed the manuscript, communicate with the author regarding your decision and any changes you suggest and send a copy of the communication to the AE. If you determine that the manuscript is ready for publication (assuming the changes you have suggested), send manuscript processing forms (see Sample 8) to the author and request their return (see Sample 9).
3. Close-out procedures

All materials for an issue are forwarded to the Managing/Copy Editor, to arrive by the appropriate target date (see Production Schedule). These materials should include:

(a) a cover letter outlining all materials
(b) a table of contents
(c) information for the front and back covers
(d) a list of guest reviewers who have served since the previous issue
(e) ads or announcements in addition to those provided by the ABAI office
(f) for each manuscript to be published,
   • one electronic copy, marked as appropriate by the Editor (and/or AE)

SAMPLE 9: Manuscript processing forms (2 pages)

Reference Check Form

I hereby certify that I have checked all references against original sources and I have verified that they are correct in all forms, including title, volume number, and page number.

__________________________________   _________________________________
Signature       Date

Editors_Manual_2013.pdf
SAMPLE 10: Editor’s letter of final acceptance (of ms handled by AE)

The Behavior Analyst

Department of Psychology
UNC at Wilmington
Wilmington, NC 28403

Carol Pilgrim
Editor

Telephone: (910) 962-3288
Facsimile: (910) 962-7010
E-mail: pilgrimc@uncwil.edu

February 13, 2004

Dr. X
University of X
Anywhere, USA

Dear Dr. X,

I am writing to send my congratulations regarding your manuscript with co-authors (MS #0X-XXR), “Article name.” Your paper makes an excellent contribution. The analytic approach to the rate-building literature review was informative and thought provoking, and your suggestions for future research right on the money. I feel certain that your work will inspire others to evaluate more carefully claims about the effects of rate-building as a component of teaching programs, and we can always hope that additional empirical attention will be inspired as well. The paper is beautifully written as well – an editor could hardly ask for more! In short, I am delighted to send this letter of final acceptance for publication in the Spring issue of The Behavior Analyst.

Thanks to your careful preparation and Nancy Neef’s excellent editing, the manuscript is in fine form, and I have no further details to trouble you about. You will see just a few very minor editing changes on the hard copy of the manuscript when you receive your page proofs. You can decide then if there are any changes that you’d prefer not to include. Kathy Hill, our Managing Editor, will put the article into final format and deal with any remaining issues of style. You will hear from her in the next few months regarding page proofs, reprints, and copyright. Please note that authors’ rights are in every way protected.

Again, please accept my congratulations on this engaging contribution, and thank you for submitting it to The Behavior Analyst.

Sincerely,

Carol Pilgrim
Editor
Office Procedures

A. Reimbursement for expenses

Editorial expenses will generally be minimal with the use of e-mail and electronic resources, and institutional franking. AEs should send receipts for any expenses incurred and not covered (e.g., supplies) to the Editor. The Editor will forward receipts (as well as those for expenses he/she incurs) to the ABAI office.

B. Office hints

It is helpful to keep manuscript files in separate sections for “active” and “inactive” manuscripts. The active file can be divided into sections for manuscripts (i) in the review process, (ii) recommended for publication with revisions, and (iii) recommended for revision and resubmission. The inactive file can be divided into sections for manuscripts (i) that have been rejected, or which the author does not plan to revise and resubmit, and (ii) that have been published or sent to the publisher.
Editorial Board Management

A. Appointments to editorial board

Editorial board appointments are made by the journal editor. Arrange editorial board appointments so that approximately 1/3 of the members rotate off and are replaced by new members each year. No member should serve on the editorial board for more than 3 consecutive years. The data from the reviewer workload sheet you keep will be helpful in deciding whether or not to renew an appointment to the editorial board. If the reviewer workload sheet shows that an editorial board member has not returned reviews, has been consistently late with reviews, or has frequently refused to review manuscripts, s/he should not be reappointed. It is also a good idea to consult the Associate Editors (and perhaps the previous Editor) for their opinions about board members who have written either especially helpful or poor (e.g., superficial) reviews.

In deciding on individuals to invite to serve on the editorial board, consider the following factors:

- Maintaining a balance of experienced and new reviewers. Experienced reviewers and recognized scholars often have valuable perspectives resulting from their long histories, and lend credibility to an editorial board. At the same time, it is important to cultivate the skills of new reviewers. More junior individuals (who might value an editorial board appointment on their curriculum vitae) often give reviews a great deal of time and attention.

- Maintaining a balance across areas of expertise. You will want to have editorial board members who can review manuscripts on the range of topics that are likely to be submitted to the journal. If many editorial board members are limited to idiosyncratic topics, there may be little call for their services. If the editorial board is too narrowly concentrated, potential authors of manuscripts that fall outside that range may believe that their work will not be reviewed by experts in a position to appreciate its importance.

- Maintaining a demographic balance (e.g., male and female; international representation).

- Reviewer history. Consider the quality of the reviews of individuals who have served on the journal’s (or other) editorial board, and of individuals who have served as guest reviewers.

- Recommendations of AEs. Because AEs depend to a large extent on the reviewers’ perspectives in making an informed (and timely) editorial decision, it is appropriate that they have available reviewers whom they trust.

When inviting individuals to serve on the editorial board, send a letter that is congratulatory, outlines the anticipated scope of their responsibilities (e.g., reviewing approximately X number of manuscripts per year), specifies any benefits and requests a reply by a given date. You should also request that they indicate specific areas or topics relevant to the journal in which they have expertise and would be prepared to review manuscripts. (See Sample 11.)

When an editorial board member’s term has expired, send the individual a letter of appreciation for his or her service to the journal. Prepare a list of all individuals whose terms have expired since the previous ABAI convention, and forward it to the ABAI office by April 15.
Dear Dr. X,

I am writing to confirm your appointment to the Editorial Board of *The Behavior Analyst* for a three-year term beginning X, 201X. I understand from our recent e-mail exchange that you are agreeable to serving on the Board.

As you know, the primary responsibility of Board members is to provide thorough evaluations of manuscripts submitted for publication. These reviews are essential for ensuring that the papers accepted for publication meet the high standards of quality that our readers expect. Further, whether the paper is accepted or not, the reviews can have significant educational value for the authors, for members of the editorial team, and, indirectly, for the field. I am delighted therefore, that *The Behavior Analyst* will have the benefit of your analysis and advice.

The importance of timely reviews also deserves special mention. Even under the best circumstances, authors experience a fairly long delay between submission of a manuscript and feedback from an action editor. Excessive delays diminish the attractiveness of a journal as a publication outlet. It is critical, therefore, that each person involved in the editorial process complete his or her task on schedule. The current editorial staff for TBA have made timely manuscript processing a top priority. Toward this end, when you receive a manuscript to review, the cover letter will indicate a target date for return of the review to the Action Editor—one that should give you approximately three weeks for your work. You have my thanks in advance for making the timely completion of your review a high priority among your many competing demands.

To close, let me say once again how pleased I am by your willingness to serve on the Editorial Board and by your obvious commitment to maintaining the quality of *The Behavior Analyst*. I look forward to working with you.

Best regards,
Please return this page indicating your preferred contact information and primary areas of interest. Many thanks!

Name:

Preferred Mailing Address:

Work Phone:

E-mail:

Fax:

Areas of interest: (Please check all that apply, and feel free to add as needed)

_______ Applied Behavior Analysis   _______ Interdisciplinary Issues
_______ Autism                     _______ Neurobiology
_______ Behavioral Medicine        _______ Pharmacology
_______ Business & Industry (OBM)  _______ Philosophical Issues
_______ Clinical                   _______ Private Events
_______ Cognitive Psychology       _______ Professional Issues
_______ Conceptual Issues          _______ Schedules of Reinf
_______ Cultural Analysis          _______ Selectionism
_______ Developmental Disabilities _______ Social Behavior
_______ EAB – Human                _______ Staff Training
_______ EAB – Nonhuman             _______ Stimulus Control
_______ Education                  _______ Teaching Behavior Analysis
_______ Ethical & Legal Issues      _______ Verbal Behavior
_______ History                    _______ Others:________________
_______ Human Development          _______ ________________
B. Preparing Associate Editors

Associate editors are appointed by the journal editor. The associate editors you appoint will presumably have editorial experience (e.g., on the Board of Editors and/or in an editorial capacity for other journals). Nevertheless, they will need to be given information that will aid them in their task. The following materials will be helpful:

- A manual outlining the steps of the editorial process (this can be adapted from the material in this manual).
- Templates for history sheets, letterhead, letters, and other forms they will use.
- A list of Editorial Board member names, addresses, phone numbers, email addresses, and areas of expertise/interest (updated annually).

In order to make appropriate editorial judgments, AEs will need to have a sense of standards that you may have for manuscripts to be considered acceptable, of types of manuscripts that you would especially like to attract, etc. Feedback on editorial correspondence, and circulating samples of editorial correspondence, comments, or other materials, can be informative. Once an associate editor is appointed, a copy of his/her Curriculum Vitae and a rationale for the appointment should be forwarded to the Publication Board Coordinator (who will, in turn, forward it to the ABAI office.)

Editor Election

You will be responsible for chairing the search for your successor. The process is outlined below:

Nomination Committee:

- Chair: Current Editor of Journal
- Members:
  - Current editors of All 3 journals (3)
  - Chair of publication board (1)
- Procedures:
  - Current Editor solicits nominations (January-February) from
    - Editorial board
    - Associate Editors (current and previous in the Editor’s term)
    - ABAI Council
    - Special Interest Group (if applicable)
    - Call published in newsletter
  - Nomination Committee determines short list of candidates from those nominated (early March)
    considerations include:
• willingness to serve
• editorial experience/history
• institutional resources and support
• publication record
• support of others who have had relevant professional experience with the candidate
• evidence of organizational skills
• other qualifications the committee deems important

- Committee Chair contacts candidates to determine interest, availability, resources; obtains vitae if response is positive (mid-March)
- Nomination Committee ranks final candidates (early April)
- Chair of Publication Board submits its recommendation(s), providing at least two nominees, and summary of qualifications of candidates to the ABAI CEO for consideration by ABAI Council at May meeting
Appendix A

Sample Decision Letters

Revise and resubmit (MS # 03-07)
Reject (MS # 03-07)
Additional revision (MS#03-31)
Thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider your manuscript for publication in *The Behavior Analyst*. I was fortunate to obtain reviews (attached) from 4 individuals who are quite knowledgeable about the development of fluent performance and who have expertise in precision teaching. The reviewers had high praise for multiple aspects of your manuscript, ranging from the topic to your clear and concise writing style. Although their editorial recommendations differed (covering the range from accept with revision to reject), the reviewers agreed that the issue of fluency is of unquestionable importance, and that a review and discussion of this topic stands to make a timely contribution to behavior analysis and education. Indeed, all of the reviewers commented on the potential value of both an evaluative review of the literature on fluency and the delineation of critical methodological issues that might guide research on the topic. Based on my own reading of the manuscript, I concur that publication of an article along these lines is certainly warranted. In order to do justice to your aims of assessing “the validity, generality, and implications of research on rate-building procedures” (p. 2), however, some key revisions would be needed. I will summarize here the main issues of concern, but refer you to the excellent set of reviews and the copies of the manuscript we have marked (which I will send) for elaboration and additional comments for your consideration.

Although the purpose of the manuscript is to examine research on rate building and fluency, the scope of the review is limited to Precision Teaching (PT). The rationale for focusing only on PT is unclear. Because PT refers only to a method for measuring student learning and evaluating instruction using frequency and celeration, it is neither limited to, nor does it encompass all research on rate-building techniques (Reviewer A).

In fact, as argued by Reviewer D, PT has not been principally concerned with rate-building procedures per se, but with the relation between high-rate responding (however established) and fluency outcomes. However, given that evaluations employing PT typically do not use experimental designs, that literature is less likely to yield the type of evidence (verification of functional relations) that is common to behavior analysis (Reviewer A). Importantly, because the restricted focus on PT may not...
RE: MS # 03-16
Page Two

adequately characterize the literature on rate building and fluency, conclusions relevant to issues addressed by the manuscript (e.g., student preferences) may be inaccurate or misleading (see comments of Reviewers A, C, and D). Reviewers A, B, and C have each suggested additional sources that might be included in your review of the literature.

PT is often subject to misconceptions, and the term itself may be a source of the confusion. As noted by Reviewers A and D, it is important to ensure conceptual consistency and clarity in descriptions of PT (e.g., with respect to independent and dependent variables). In addition, specific recommendations of control procedures that might enhance the rigor of investigations of fluency would be very beneficial in guiding further research on the topic, consistent with an aim of the manuscript (Reviewers B and C).

In summary, the reviewers and I are quite enthusiastic about the contributions that might be realized with the stated aims of this manuscript. I am optimistic about the prospects for the ultimate publication of a revised manuscript given your attention to the above issues. Our suggestion to broaden the scope of the literature reviewed, and the possibility that this might alter some of your conclusions, would inevitably produce some substantially different content, however. For that reason, I am recommending that you revise and resubmit the manuscript. I hope that you will find the reviews and the suggestions marked on the copies of the manuscript helpful in doing so. Please submit your revision to the Editor, along with a cover letter stating that it is a revision of MS # 03-16.

Sincerely,

Attachments
Cc: Editor
Reviewers
Dear Dr. xx:

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to *The Behavior Analyst*. I was fortunate to obtain reviews from 4 behavior analysts who are highly regarded for their expertise in the area of autism and/or verbal behavior. They found your arguments for a behavioral versus a neurobiological account of autism to be provocative and intriguing. Three of the reviewers, however, also had some reservations concerning the manuscript, as did I.

The manuscript might be considered from the perspective of having both a conceptual and epidemiological focus. The former concerns the approach toward how the disorder is considered, and the latter concerns its origin and spread. It seems the manuscript is concerned with both, i.e., how autism can be conceptualized or analyzed with respect to environmental contingencies, and with the consideration of those contingencies as causal factors in the origin of the disorder.

From a conceptual perspective, you (a) discuss the role of various reinforcement contingencies in the development of behaviors associated with a diagnosis of autism, and (b) argue that we need not consider neurobiological variables. With respect to the former, similar points were made several decades ago by Bijou (1966) in the classic article, “A functional analysis of retarded development.” For example, Bijou described how development could be hampered through inadequate reinforcement and discrimination histories, such as with extinction or noncontingent reinforcement (similar to how you describe “extinction of verbal behavior” and reinforcement of a repertoire of nonresponding through “anticipating a child’s needs”). Bijou also described “situations in which retardation may develop because reinforcement is made continent upon ‘undesirable’ behavior”: “Such behavior… may become so strong that it becomes the major way of responding (e.g., having temper tantrums, screaming, and crying). Under these circumstances, new learning (shaping) of socially and educationally desirable behavior would be slow or even static…[and] may serve to discourage people from approaching and participating in prolonged educational and social interactions with the child” (p. 17). This is similar to your description of “reinforcement for aversive vocal manding that is incompatible with acquiring appropriate verbal behavior.” Since Bijou’s article, a great deal of research in applied behavior analysis has addressed these issues.

Like you, Bijou eschewed biological factors as explanations for disorders, but for different reasons. Bijou asserted that “development consists of progressive changes in interactions between the individual as a total functioning biological system, and the environmental events” (italics his), where “biological conditions of development [can] deviate in the direction of slowing down the pace of successive interactional changes” (p. 2). In other words, instead of invoking (neuro)biological impairments themselves as causes of atypical development, he urged their consideration in the context of stimulus-response relations (i.e., where biological factors impair the response or stimulus function of the stimulus-response relation necessary for normal development to occur). This seems to be where your conceptualization differs (i.e., in denying the need for acknowledgement or consideration of neurobiological factors in individuals with autism), and where Reviewers B, C, and D found you to be on shaky ground. From a conceptual
standpoint, then, the contribution of your account (e.g., relative to Bijou’s more complete analysis) needs to be more firmly established.

From an epidemiological perspective, you argue that the origins of autism are based in the contingencies arranged by care providers and others in the child’s environment (and not to neurobiological variables). The criteria by which causal relations are established in epidemiological research include the consistency, strength (comparisons of the disorder with or without the presumed risk factors), coherence (agreement about the risk factor and the known facts about the disorder), and specificity of the associations between the presumed risk factors and the disorder, and the results of preventive clinical trials (see Winett, Morre, & Anderson, 1991). In making a case for the causal factors for autism, it would be helpful to consider the evidence according to epidemiological criteria.

For a disorder to be attributable only to the selected set of variables or relations, the disorder should be evident in the presence of those relations, the relations should be evident in the presence of the disorder, and the disorder should have a relative low probability of occurrence in the absence of those relations. Reviewers B, C, and D questioned some of your conclusions on each count. For example, if “reinforcement for gestural manding and other nonvocal forms of manding” (p. 18) is causally related to autism, then autism should be common among prelingually deaf children, and in other populations in which sign language or forms of augmentative or alternative communication are used. Another example is “extinction of verbal behavior” in which you propose that “any event or environment that decreases the time available for parents or caregivers to teach language to their child may potentially delay or prevent acquisition of verbal behavior and in more severe cases may result in a diagnosis of autism of PDD” (p. 20). You cite working parents who leave their children in the care of others as a factor (p. 19). Such a conclusion would require evidence of the association of the risk factor and the disorder (e.g., retrospective studies showing a high incidence of autism among children who spend large amounts of time in day care, a history of day care in a high proportion of children with autism, and/or the absence of autism in children who are cared for by a nonworking parent). Reviewers B, C, and D and I did not find compelling support for your arguments.

It may be that autism represents an interaction (conditional relations) between neurobiological and other behavioral processes, although that remains to be seen. Regardless of whether the etiology of autism is biological or contingency-shaped, there is little question that behavioral approaches to analysis and treatment have been highly effective in attenuating the difficulties associated with a diagnosis of autism. Thus the debate over etiology may be moot for behavior analysts (see related comments of Reviewer D).

For the above reasons, I must recommend against publication of the manuscript in The Behavior Analyst. A revised version of the manuscript might have the potential for greater impact in a journal specializing in autism and related disorders, child development, or perhaps public health, depending on how it is cast. The manuscript seems to have a solid foundation with respect to encouraging examination of the role of behavioral processes in development as it pertains to autism, and you clearly have a great deal of direct experience with young children with autism to draw upon. It might be helpful, however, for you to reconsider some of your propositions and the evidence for them, and also to clarify some of the terminology (as suggested by each of the reviewers).

Although this editorial decision is probably disappointing, I hope that you will find the detailed reviews helpful in the development and/or communication of your perspectives. We very much appreciated your giving us the opportunity to consider the manuscript.

Sincerely,
References


Attachments

Cc: Editor

Reviewers
December 15, 2003

ADDRESS

Re: MS # 03-31 (Revision of #02-28) 

Dear Dr. xx:

I was very pleased to receive a revision of your manuscript. I solicited comments from one of the original reviewers (those comments are attached), and an expert in organizational behavior management who had not seen the previous manuscript. The latter individual was unable to complete the review, but I did not think it was necessary to further delay the editorial process.

Suggestions for revising the original manuscript centered upon (a) clarifying the conceptual analysis; (b) focusing on research that directly relates to health issues generally, and occupational safety specifically; (c) providing examples of interventions that better illustrate the practical implications of a discounting analysis as applied to occupational safety; and (d) highlighting the social importance of manuscript’s focus.

I agree with Reviewer A that, as a result of the changes you made, one “can now imagine what a publishable paper would look like.” Therefore, I am pleased to recommend publication of the manuscript pending additional revision.

You did an excellent job of highlighting the importance of the focus on safety and the potential contributions of a discounting analysis. However, the manuscript could be strengthened with further attention to the first three areas indicated above.

With respect to (a), there are still a few areas in which the conceptual analysis might be clarified. First, please refer to Reviewer A’s point #1 regarding the description and operation of the various types of discounting.

Second, be careful that your wording does not inadvertently suggest that impulsivity is an attribute that “causes” the very behavior it describes (e.g., “…one can predict that a more impulsive individual would be more inclined to discount the value of the safety benefits,” “…someone less impulsive…would be less likely to attempt crossing the roof”).

Third, it would be helpful to clarify the conceptual basis for the illustrative intervention strategies. For example, the suggestion on page 13 that “intervention efforts would likely target…the probabilistic nature of the safety benefits” and the subsequent statement that “…a key factor to the reduction of impulsive choice is the degree to which an individual has information about the…choice consequences” implies that
probability discounting would be affected directly by providing information about actual probabilities. (Of course, that would probably be counterproductive because the probability of sustaining a serious injury at any MS given choice point might be relatively low.) It is only later when the imagery intervention is suggested that it becomes clear that the intent is to “offset” probability (i.e., by presenting a competing stimulus dimension) rather than to alter its salience. The same applies to the examples of interventions for nurses’ glove use (p. 15).

Another class of strategies is described on page 14 in relation to effort discounting. Here you suggest “…high rates of effort discounting might be mitigated by a reduction in overall energy expenditure, [such as] requiring workers to take regular rest breaks”. Perhaps you could describe this in the context of motivating operations. Specifically, breaks might serve as an abolishing operation by decreasing the effectiveness of escape from effortful tasks as a reinforcer (see Laraway, Snyderski, Michael, & Poling, 2003).

I appreciate your efforts to illustrate the practical implications of a discounting analysis as applied to occupational safety with the above examples, consistent with our recommendation (c). However, keep in mind that what might seem simple on paper might not be straightforward in practice. For example, regarding your statement that “impulsive choice preference may possibly be reduced by something as simple as getting a good night’s sleep” (p. 14), it is unlikely that workers who are sleep deprived lacked only that suggestion; many variables that compete with sleep (e.g., a baby in the family, a second job, late night social habits) can be difficult for another to control. Similarly, production cost contingencies might discourage employers from giving frequent breaks, and unions might make noises about response cost contingencies. My intent is not to “rain on your examples,” but to suggest that you avoid presenting them in a way that readers might perceive as naïve or impractical. Wilde (1991), for example, describes the contingencies that might account for insurance companies’ failure to use strategies that have been shown to be effective in reducing accidents.

You might want to use some examples of interventions from the literature on occupational safety, thereby also further addressing our previous suggestion (b). For example, Ludwig and Geller (1991) reported that “promise cards” and reminder signs (similar to the “commitment” strategy you suggested for glove wearing, but without the response cost component) were sufficient to increase pizza drivers’ use of safety belts. Incentive strategies have been found to be uniformly effective (see MacAfee & Winn, 1989), and there appears to a correlation between size of reward and the reduction in accidents (Wilde, 1991). This lends some support to strategies that serve to mitigate probability discounting in risk taking (also, see Wilde, 1991, for an analysis of the role of economics in risk taking as applied to safety, as well as related research cited in Critchfield & Kollins, 2001).

Much of the material on measurement of discounting (pp. 8-11) could be deleted. I agree with Reviewer A (point 2) that this material seems somewhat tangential to the focus on safety, and disrupts the flow of the manuscript. As suggested by Reviewer A, you need only describe discounting functions as the context for interpreting subsequent examples pertaining to safe versus risky practices in the work place.
Please refer to the marked copy of the manuscript for additional editorial suggestions. You can return your revision to me electronically (as an attachment in MS Word format), within 90 days. If you anticipate needing more time, or have any questions about the requested changes, please let me know. I am eager to receive your revision and hope that its ultimate publication will contribute to research and practices that lead to fewer workplace casualties.

Sincerely,

Attachments
Cc: Editor, Reviewer A

References


Appendix B

Editor’s Annual Report

Sample

The Behavior Analyst
Annual Report 2007
Prepared by Marc Branch, Editor

Journal Mission: (As stated in the Instructions For Contributors) The Behavior Analyst contains general interest articles on theoretical, experimental, and applied topics in behavior analysis. Articles on the past, present, and future of behavior analysis, as well as its relation to other fields, are particularly appropriate for the journal. The Behavior Analyst also publishes literature reviews, discussions of previously published work, reinterpretations of published data, and articles on behaviorism as a philosophy that are suitable to the general readership of the journal.

This report covers activities of The Behavior Analyst (TBA) for the calendar year 2006. The current journal Editor (Marc Branch) and Associate Editors (Mike Dougher and Greg Hanley) began service in August, 2004. Thus, 2006 is the final full year of their stewardship. All terms will end July 31, 2007. The association has the extremely good fortune of having Michael Dougher agree to serve as the incoming editor. Mike has been an outstanding associate editor, so there is every reason to believe that the journal will be in good hands under his leadership.

Papers published during 2006

During 2006, Volume 29 of TBA was published. It contained 25 papers (compared to 14 in 2005). Ten (compared to 9 in 2005) were featured articles. Ten papers were “In Response” to previously published articles (compared to 4 in 2005, largely due to the number of reactions to the featured article by Baron and Galizio). One memorial and two book reviews also appeared, as did a two-paper special section on Chomsky and Skinner. Volume 29 contained 287 content pages. Table 1 shows that the content analysis of Volume 29 was largely similar to that of previous years. Total pages published are also within the prior range, which indicates that there is no need to consider increasing the number of issues per year at this time. This year’s (i.e., 2007) Spring issue will have 7 featured articles, one “In Response” piece, and a book review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Featured Articles</th>
<th>On Terms</th>
<th>In Response</th>
<th>On Books</th>
<th>Special Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 1
Journal Content
Processing of Manuscripts Submitted in 2005

Between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2006, 37 new manuscripts were submitted (versus 39 for 2005). At the time this report was prepared (mid-March, 2007), 13 manuscripts had been received in 2007, so manuscript flow appears to be continuing as it has in the recent past. The percentage of papers accepted in 2006 (54%) was the same as the previous year’s. As shown in Table 2, the mean processing time for articles in 2006 was 2.2 months, which was in the range of the past few years. Mean processing time (Rcpt- Decis) is defined here as the number of months between the date a paper was received by the editor and the date the editor or associate editor informed the author of the initial decision. The longest time was 4 months. Action-editor time, the time from the receipt of the last review to when a decision letter went out, remained reasonable, although the ranges for the last two years reveal an occasional paper that took a while to process. Relative to past years, processing times have continued to be reasonable, and are within the range of most major journals. Rapid turn-around for authors remains an important goal for TBA, and timely processing by reviewers and AEs will be emphasized again in 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>#MSs</th>
<th>% Acpt</th>
<th>Rept-Decis (mo*)</th>
<th>AE Decis (days*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M   Med Range</td>
<td>M   Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.4 2 1-4</td>
<td>19 0-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.9 2 1-3</td>
<td>19 0-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.0 2 0.25-5</td>
<td>9 0-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.1 2 0-4</td>
<td>19 0-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.2 2.5 0-4</td>
<td>19 0-61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board of Editors
The Board of Editors at the time of this report is shown in the Table below. Board members listed for 2004-2007 will rotate off in May, 2007. The members listed for 2006-2009 began their term with the Spring Issue of Volume 29 and will serve through May, 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derek Blackman</td>
<td>James Carr</td>
<td>Alyce Dickinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Chase</td>
<td>Jesse Dallery</td>
<td>Patrick Friman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln da Silva Gimenes</td>
<td>Martha Pelaez</td>
<td>Jonathan Kanter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Kaminski</td>
<td>Cynthia Pietras</td>
<td>Edward Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Leigland</td>
<td>Ruth Anne Rehfeldt</td>
<td>Oliver Mudford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Osnes</td>
<td>Henry Schlinger</td>
<td>Bryan Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Ruiz</td>
<td>Rachel Thompson</td>
<td>Alexandra Rutherford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francois Tonneau</td>
<td>Kelly Wilson</td>
<td>Kathryn Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Shull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Ellis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas Woods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, 22 individuals served as ad hoc, or guest, reviewers for one or more manuscripts during 2006.

Other Accomplishments

Mike Dougher and Greg Hanley are to be commended for their service as Associate Editors, and Mike will take the reins as editor on August 1, 2007. Kathy Hill continues her invaluable contribution as Managing Editor.

The conversion to electronic submission is essentially complete. The last adjustment was to change the instructions for authors that are printed in the journal. Now both the print version and the web site indicate that electronic submissions are preferred. All papers for the 2006 year were handled electronically, thus eliminating the need for, cost of, and delay caused by, standard mailing.

The Spring issue of 2007 was processed on schedule, as were both issues of Volume 29.

Through the energies and hard work of the ABA office, TBA continues to enjoy a sophisticated Web presence.

Additional Projects

Increasing the number of quality TBA submissions remains an important goal. I continue to invite manuscripts on a range of topics, and have had some success in this regard, but there is significant lag time. The annual convention continues to be a good source of possibilities.
Finances

Because electronic copies were available of all papers for Volume 29, no expenses were incurred by the editor’s office. All of the papers for the Spring, 2007 issue also were in electronic form, so, again, no expenses have occurred. Only if it becomes necessary to send paper to Kathy Hill will there be any expenses this year, and given recent experience, that seems unlikely. I do request, however, that the council consider purchasing a new printer for Kathy. She reports that her current one is limping, and given the absolutely outstanding job Kathy does for us (Compare JEAB copy editing before and after she stopped doing it.), and considering that we have had no editorial office expenses during my term, an outlay for a printer seems reasonable. My specific recommendation is that she be authorized to spend up to $300 for a new printer.