



BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme

Journal editors/editorial boards

Introduction

Publication in philosophy journals plays a major role in the reputation and career progression of their authors, as – to a lesser extent – does participation in the selection process through membership of editorial boards, refereeing, etc. The recommendations below aim to ensure that, as far as possible, women are not disadvantaged in either capacity by their gender. Anonymity in the refereeing process is especially important here, given the well-documented potential for unconscious bias (see ‘Further Information’ below).

For further information on the BPA/SWIP Good Practice Scheme, please see our general guidance notes on the BPA Good Practice website (bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice).

Recommendations

- The Editorial Board (or appropriate alternative) should review the extent to which the editorial and refereeing processes are anonymous. If any stage of the process is not anonymous, the Board should consider whether to introduce anonymity, and should only agree not to do so if there are very good practical reasons not to.
- The Editorial Board (or appropriate alternative) should seek to ensure that there is a reasonable proportion of women both on the Board itself and amongst the journal’s pool of referees.
- The Editorial Board (or appropriate alternative) should consider having, and making available to referees, an explicit editorial policy on refereeing; there is an example, from the journal *Cognition*, on the Good Practice website. Such a policy might also include specific requests concerning anonymity, e.g. that referees do not google paper titles, and that they alert the editor prior to refereeing the paper if they know or have a strong suspicion about who wrote it.