Farewell from an Editor-in-Chief

I'm leaving this position now. And although the first issue was published five years ago, NWR still feels new to me. Five years should be long enough to learn a trade, but in Open Access publishing, which is still developing rapidly, merely keeping up would be a full time job. And NWR is not, and will most likely never be anyone's full time job – NWR is a side project, kept rolling by the editors, next to all the rest.

During my years as the editor-in-chief, NWR has found some kind of stability. It has found readers, and it has been found by fantastic authors submitting interesting papers, and to my great pleasure, it has met much support – reviewers, and others willing to help. We need all of this. Editing a journal – in particular an independent Open Access journal – is hard work, and we need help and cheers to keep the energy up. During all this time, I have, together with the editors and the editorial board, tried to do what can be done to make NWR a journal which looks out for the interest of the authors. Authors need their papers to find their way out to the right readers, and Open Access is a good choice for achieving that goal. (All papers published in NWR reach 500 pdf downloads in a year or two – a good number.) Authors need a well-indexed journal, and we've submitted NWR for evaluation to Scopus and ISI Arts & Humanities Index (no result yet), and have tried to be open to the wishes of authors and potential authors. We've carried out surveys in our research environment to find out more about what the authors feel is important; one result is that in philosophy, APCs (article processing charges, or author fees) would make publishing in NWR impossible for many. (If you would like to know more about the journal's organization and its road to becoming an independent Open Access journal, the case study on it is forthcoming in *Information Research* (Open Access) later this year. It was carried out by myself and Mikael Laakso (Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland).)

There have been heavy times, too. The update of our platform to OJS 3 in the end of 2016 and the beginning of 2017 was time-

consuming and demanding for the editor-in-chief, and there are still improvements to be made. The good news is that the new platform works well, and infrastructure support provided by the Bergen University Library, which hosts the journal today, is very valuable. Furthermore, now there is a better than ever commenting/annotating function available for use on NWR called Hypothes.is. To use it you need to register separately with the service, for instance by opening the tool on the right hand side when an article PDF is open.

NWR has also received its – luckily limited – share of academic rage, set off by rejected papers and lack of insight into the kind of double-blind peer review procedure NWR applies for the article section (but not for the other sections of the journal). In our peer review procedure, much weight is placed on the reviewers' views, although all publication decisions are made solely by the editors, in a way which aims at treating all submitting authors equally. As a result, highly merited researchers sometimes see their papers declined by this little journal from a faraway corner of the world.

I am very happy that Simo Säätelä (Professor in philosophy at the University of Bergen, Norway) takes over as editor-in-chief. What more can one wish for than a successor more merited than oneself? Simo was, together with Alois Pichler, one of the first editors of NWR and I know him as a very just, systematic and hard-working editor with a fantastic (eagle) eye for detail. Dr. Gisela Bengtsson and Dr. Tove Österman (both Uppsala University) are the editors of the 2017 and 2018 issues. While this is their first issue, it is my last, and I am sad to leave this team. This spring, the board of NWS appointed a new, separate editorial board for the journal, a change which I see as beneficial to both the journal and the Society. Thank you for joining! I am sure that NWR will change, and above all, improve.

Should I say any last words, they would have to do with how I see that the world of publishing, our system of scholarly communication, should be improved. One thing I've realized, is that it is not always easy to keep one's head cool – each of us needs to think about our place in the process. As reviewers, we need to keep the tone constructive to pull our weight in the improvement

of the sector. And as editors, we need to remember that we service the authors and the readers alike, but also to understand the power involved in editorial decisions, and how the publishing venue works for the authors in their careers. As authors we need to think about the readers, to really do what we can to get our message across, and to do this in an inclusive way. The whole point of scholarly communication, which is what publishing is about, is getting research out to those who it is for, and only secondly should it be thought of as a vehicle for career promotion. That being said, let me present to you the new journal section called "Replies", inaugurated by Nuno Venturinha (New University, Lissabon). We welcome short contributions, relating to material previously published in NWR, which carry issues of broader interest or validity in a constructive manner. (These contributions are not subjected to blind peer review.)

Thank you for all kind words, and for the joyful collaboration, and also, for your immense patience when things have not turned out the way they should as soon as they should have. More of that will be needed.

Åbo/Turku, Finland June 10, 2017

Yrsa Neuman,
Editor-in-Chief 2012-2017

The NWR Editorial Board 2017-

Gisela Bengtsson, Uppsala University, Sweden
Anne-Marie Søndergaard Christensen, University of Southern Denmark
Martin Gustafsson, Åbo Akademi University, Finland
Lars Hertzberg, Åbo Akademi University, Finland
Yrsa Neuman, Åbo Akademi University, Finland
Alois Pichler, University of Bergen, Norway
Simo Säätelä, University of Bergen, Norway
Tove Österman, Uppsala University, Sweden