Must reviewers be senior academics?
Reviewers can be postdocs as well. I also tend to involve my final-year PhD students in reviewing with me if they're completing a PhD on the topic. This helps them better understand the review process. Postdocs also tend to write more detailed reviews, compared to senior academics who are pressed for time.

The turnaround time depends on the reviewers. I sometimes have to remind them, either through automated emails or personally through my work email. Automated emails are easy to ignore, and I find that a personal relationship with the reviewers is important.

How do you view papers with negative findings as an editor?
For me, negative findings are very important. I tend to look favorably upon these papers if the negative finding is something new and unexpected. Negative findings should not be penalised if the paper addresses a valid question and we know the result is not due to a problem with methodology.

What is your opinion on open-source data?
I have not yet seen the effect of publishing raw data on journals. I believe we are moving in the right direction, and we now have several consortia with large datasets such as Enigma. We need large samples for neuroimaging research and genetics, and we are now finding ways to do this within the ethical approvals.

I support the creation of consortia. A lot of funding is currently spent on small studies that cannot answer certain questions by themselves. To answer these questions, we must merge datasets.

We have a duty to the people who participate in our studies and to the funders to make the best use we can of the information we have available.

Jen Botezat
Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology, and Neuroscience, King's College London

Correspondence

Good practice: ASM journals eliminate impact factor information from their journals' websites

Much has been written about the overuse and abuse of impact factors. Despite this discussion and the many convincing arguments that impact factors should *not* be used the way they are (especially for evaluation of scientists), nothing really serious has changed. Hence we would like to point out the interesting decision of the American Society for Microbiology (ASM) to *not* publish impact factors on their journals' web sites[1]. These journals are: *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy*, *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, *Infection and Immunity*, *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, *mBio*, *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*, *mSphere*, and *mSystems*.

We need to communicate this news to a much wider audience than that of the ASM. Maybe this important decision will trigger similar changes in other society journals? Imagine, if most editors and publishers get rid of impact Factors, then those administrators, politicians and others who have an unhealthy obsession with controlling scientific development will need to reconsider their affection for this metric?

Just so you know, some of the ASM journals do not have very high impact factors, but they have nothing to be ashamed of. So, let's follow ASM, and instead of talking about impact factors in our journals, let's welcome the ASM's brave and maybe groundbreaking decision.

References

1 Casadevall A, Bertuzzi S, Buchmeier MJ, Davis RJ, Drake H, Fang FC, *et al*. ASM journals eliminate impact factor information from journal websites. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews* 2016;80(3):i–ii..

Marcin Kozak
University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszów, Poland

James Hartley
Keele University, UK