Editor-in-Chief
ASA, CSSA, and SSSA Position Description

The editor-in-chief of each Society is responsible for coordinating the publications of that Society and implementing editorial policies established by that Society’s board of directors.

The editors-in-chief serve on the Editorial Policy Coordination Committee of the three societies (the ASA editor-in-chief is the chair). This committee consists of the editors-in-chief of the three societies, the editors and managing editors of all the journals, the chair of the Book & Multimedia Publishing committee, and the Societies’ Chief Operations Officer. This committee is concerned with implementing appropriate policies that cover publications of all three societies.


The editor-in-chief is responsible for advising the president, executive committee, and board of directors on all publications including those that are cosponsored by other Societies. The editor-in-chief is a nonvoting member of the board of directors. At meetings of the board of directors, the editor-in-chief recommends any editorial policy changes that need board action and advises the board on editorial and publication actions of the three societies. The editor-in-chief serves as a member of all editorial boards and publication committees and advises the president, executive committee, and board of directors on publication matters originating from these committees or elsewhere inside or outside of the Society. The editor-in-chief may be called upon to handle special problems through an appeals process and perform other editorial duties requested by the executive committee or the board of directors.

The ASA–CSSA–SSSA presidents may call upon the editors-in-chief for their advice and recommendations on all publications.

The editors-in-chief make recommendations to their respective presidents concerning the appointment or reappointment of editors of journals when their terms are about to expire or when vacancies occur for other reasons. The editors-in-chief, on behalf of the president and after consulting with the editor, appoint replacement technical editors. New technical editor positions may not be created without the approval of the sponsoring Society’s board of directors, however.

Guidelines for Professional and Ethical Conduct of the Review Process of ASA, CSSA, and SSSA Journals

Scientists agree that peer review is a cornerstone of scientific progress. As such, participating in the peer review process of ASA, CSSA, and SSSA journals is a privilege and a responsibility. A professional, objective, and thorough review process will benefit us as publishing researchers, improve the professionalism of our community, and enhance the quality of our published research. In agreeing to serve, one agrees to the following code of conduct, with the understanding that failure to serve in this capacity may lead to dismissal:

• I will take responsibility for understanding the function of my office and executing to the best of my ability all tasks that are within my area of responsibility.

• In my capacity I will work to maintain the integrity of the peer review process to ensure that the manuscript receives a thorough, quality review in accordance with the high scientific standards of the journal.

• I will handle my share of manuscripts, understanding that this is an obligation of the peer review process.
• I agree it is my responsibility to handle those manuscripts in the areas of my expertise and assist in finding persons qualified to handle papers in those areas outside my expertise.

• I will execute my role within the specified schedule of the journal, understanding that failure to do so would detract from the quality of the journal and retard the professional development of the authors affected by a delay.

• I will communicate with authors only in the capacity as defined by my role.

• I will communicate with authors in a respectful and professional manner, including substantiating comments with published sources and understanding that I represent the journal and the Society(ies) through my tone and attitude. I understand that criticism of a manuscript should not extend to personal criticism of the author(s).

• I will review each manuscript with impartiality, without regard to gender, race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, institutional affiliation, or other similar bias.

• I will evaluate manuscripts on the basis of scientific merit, with the understanding that there may be many acceptable ways to prove a hypothesis. I will respect the independence of authors and their creativity and understand that differences of opinion can be addressed in published comments within the journal as a forum for scientific debate.

• I will treat the manuscript in review as a confidential document, and neither disclose its contents outside the context of the review process, nor use its contents in my own work.

• I will avoid conflicts of interest and the appearance of conflicts of interest stemming from my relationship with the author or professional and financial circumstances that may bias my approach to a manuscript.