

From the Editor-in-Chief

Kimon Valavanis

Published online: 5 January 2007

© Springer Science + Business Media B.V. 2007

Dear Colleagues,

As we move into the 2007 issues, you will notice a mix of papers with very diverse themes and topics even within the same issue. The main reason for this diversity is that we are trying to minimize the queue of ‘accepted papers’ that were submitted and reviewed using the ‘old’ system. We feel that in order to do justice to their authors, we must give priority to those papers and publish them with no (further) delay.

However, as you must have noticed by now, the online submission system using the Editorial Manager has allowed the Editorial Board to ‘speed up’ the review process. This acceleration is already resulting in publishing the issues in the month they are supposed to appear, benefiting our readers as much as possible.

In this editorial, I would like to comment on a very important issue, relevant for every archive publication: the issue of the review process, and what we commonly refer to as acceptance/rejection ratio. Allow me to start my comment by kind of paraphrasing what all of us have stated at some point of our professional life, that is, “if one writes a paper, there is always a journal to publish it.” It is this sentence my Editorial Board colleagues and I want *never mentioned for this journal* – it is as simple as that!

Therefore, the review process is extremely thorough and as humanly objective as possible. As such, in addition to the assigned reviewers, the assigned Editor, Associate Editor(s) and the Editor-in-Chief read the paper and comment on its quality. Almost all of you who have submitted papers and received reviews – particularly for papers that are not accepted – have seen the “Note from the Editor” part that adds to the reviewers comments. In all cases, where two reviews are consistent, the Editor/Editor-in-Chief serve as the third reviewer to accelerate the process and notify the authors in a timely way.

The acceptance/rejection ratio has no quota. We aim at publishing the best papers in the journal and we will continue doing that as best as we can. We receive a large number of contributed papers per month and it is natural that some good (very good) papers do not make it. We do not want to sacrifice quality for quantity, and this is the reason why we have

K. Valavanis (✉)
Department of CSE, USF, Tampa, FL 33620, USA
e-mail: kvalavan@cse.usf.edu

absolutely no specified number of papers to be published per year. If you are interested, the acceptance ratio for the last 7–8 months is about 35–40%; we have done nothing to enforce the ratio, it is you, the reviewers, who play the key role. Looking at the data I have, my feeling is that we will stabilize around 30% over a longer period of time (if I am wrong, I will report the corrected percentage in a later editorial).

I do hope that we have clarified a few points regarding our journal. I assure you that my colleagues and I will keep on trying to improve this archive publication and implement all we stated at the beginning of this ‘second era.’ You will witness several more changes/additions as we move into this year.

Last, but not least, this issue has a combination of papers that have been in the queue for sometime waiting publication. I hope you enjoy the issue. I am waiting for your comments and feedback, and I urge you to contribute to our journal.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Valavanis', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Kimon Valavanis