

# Editors' Letter

We have now been serving as Editors-in-Chief of EJPS for a few months. We are still enjoying the role, coming to have a real sense of how much editorial work can influence the profession, for better or for worse. We are, as we expected, immensely grateful for the outstanding team of Associate Editors that we have, who are continuing to be wonderful to work with.

With the Associate Editors, we frequently discuss submissions, turning to each other for advice, and creating a shared view of what we take EJPS papers to be. This view is still shaping up, but we agree that it is valuable for EJPS papers to be broad in scope, addressing problems in a way that is accessible to the philosophy of science community at large. This doesn't exclude papers on very specific issues, which include technical material that is not widely accessible, rather it means that we encourage authors to make an effort in contextualising and motivating their work for the wider community, to increase communication and coherence across the community.

From the point of view of authors and readers, we have also made other changes. Authors could always self-select the category to which their papers belong and were published under. But we have updated the categories in the Editorial Manager!

You can now choose from the following types of paper:

- General Philosophy of Science
- History and Philosophy of Science
- Philosophy of Science in Practice
- Historical and Social Studies of Science
- Philosophy of Technology and Information
- Formal Methods and Exact Sciences
- Philosophy of the Natural Sciences
- Philosophy of the Life Sciences
- Philosophy of the Social Sciences and Humanities
- Philosophy of the Sciences of Mind and Brain
- Philosophy of the Biomedical Sciences

This means that you can still categorise your paper as addressing a particular group of sciences. However, there is also the option to categorise it according to what approach in philosophy of science you take, rather than primarily based on what scientific area your papers talks about.

We think this should have three major benefits, all of them reflecting the sheer diversity we see around us in the flourishing work in philosophy of science. First, it will help us understand what authors want to do in their papers, and therefore help us to select reviewers accordingly. In general, we are keen to support authors and champion a collegial reviewing process. To this end, we updated the reviewer's guide on the Editorial Manager. If you reviewed a paper for us recently, you might have noticed it. We are pleased to say that,

while finding reviewers in a short time continues to be challenging, reviewers have responded very positively to the change in guidance.

Secondly, it is becoming increasingly common for philosophical work on science to address more than one scientific discipline. Certain themes in philosophy of science transverse scientific disciplines, rather than being restricted to one. So we hope that the new categories for papers will support authors who wish to create bridges between, say mechanistic explanation in biology and in economics, or between theory change in physics and in medicine.

Thirdly, we hope these categories will be more usable by authors interested in relating philosophy of science to other academic disciplines which study the sciences. These are now very many, ranging beyond the well known history of science to include public understanding of science, sociology, and various fields studying the use of science in policy.

In total, you can see that we are trying to support and encourage work that is interdisciplinary in *all* the different ways in which philosophy of science is now interdisciplinary.

We very much look forward to receiving your manuscripts, and we hope you will also assist us in in the reviewing process.

Phyllis Illari and Federica Russo  
Editors-in-Chief