A LETTER FROM THE NEW EDITOR-IN-CHIEF TO THE EDITORIAL BOARD

Dear Colleagues,

I am Dr. Zhixiong Guo, the new Editor-in-Chief for the *Journal of Enhanced Heat Transfer* (JEHT). You may simply call me James or Zhixiong. I am a Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, USA.

As you know, the late Professor Ralph L. Webb founded the JEHT in 1993, and the journal first published in 1994. I recently read the editorial "In Memoriam Professor Ralph L. Webb (1934–2011)" (IJHMT 55(4), 2012), written by Professor Richard J. Goldstein et al., and was reminded that our founding editor "succinctly stated that 'The key objective of the *Journal of Enhanced Heat Transfer* is to provide a single, international forum for papers on enhanced heat transfer.' His desire was to see this journal eventually 'viewed and accepted as 'the place' to publish papers on enhanced heat transfer.' The scope of the journal was subsequently broadened to include 'Theory and Application in High Performance Heat and Mass Transfer.'"

The journal will continue advocating and promoting research and scholarship on the subject. At the same time, I have requested our publisher to update the Aims and Scope of the journal to incorporate the latest developments and trends in this field. For example, heat transfer can be effectively enhanced through use of nanofluid, micro/nanoscale and atomic level designs, metamaterials, etc. The general topic of "high-performance" heat transfer in heat pipe technology and heat exchangers is also encouraged.

Since 2011, the JEHT has expanded from publishing four issues to six issues per year. It publishes about 500-550 printed pages and 35-40 articles annually. It is a relatively "small" volume journal in the heat transfer field. Therefore, its impact factor could be easily affected by the selection of papers. In the last two years, the impact factor of the journal has declined noticeably. We cannot expect the situation to improve substantially for 2018 (data to be out next year). Nevertheless, I sincerely offer my appreciation to both readers and authors, who have helped us by citing papers from the JEHT.

To improve its standing, I hope to receive high-quality, high-impact manuscripts from a wide range of authors – and particularly from you, my dear editorial board colleagues. I would like to thank the past editors-in-chief for their dedicated service to our journal. I also would like to thank those who served on the journal staff and its editorial board for their dedicated and thoughtful work throughout the years, especially the reviewers for providing the necessary evaluations to the submitted works.

I have been serving as a managing editor for another heat transfer journal for the past three years, so I am aware of the responsibilities and duties that the editor-in-chief's role entails. Regardless, I assume this new role with both excitement and some apprehension. Recognizing the established reputation of the JEHT in our field by heat transfer legends Ralph L. Webb and Arthur E. Bergles, I do not propose any radical changes under my leadership. However, the journal will need to continue to evolve to ensure full advantage is taken of the rapidly changing world of emerging technologies as well as publication and information dissemination.

1065–5131/19/$35.00

One immediate change will be that each editorial board member is expected to receive 10–15 manuscripts annually to coordinate the review process. Peer review is critical in the assessment of submitted manuscripts. There have been criticisms of this process, including lengthy waiting periods, mixed opinions, and use of flammable language. As David J. Stott said in 2014, "Sometimes peer review is poor at detecting errors and misconduct. However, these weaknesses can be redeemed by an effective and energetic editorial board, and they are outweighed by the benefits. There is strong consensus that accepted articles are often improved by peer review after referees' comments and criticisms are dealt with; this explicit appraisal process also helps to engender trust of the readers."

My experience serving as an editorial member for several other journals in the past eight years showed me that it can be quite difficult to find appropriate and responsible reviewers who are willing to respond in a reasonable timeframe. Indeed, many researchers are overburdened by review duties with the rapid growth of publications. To address this issue, I encourage you to actively reach out to all potential reviewers as well as use your own friends, colleagues, postdocs, and senior Ph.D. students. You may also assign yourself as an anonymous reviewer. In the near future I will request the publisher to add a function in the online submission system that requires the author to suggest three potential reviewers who have expertise on the topic of the submitted manuscript. You should certainly be cautious in the use of the suggested reviewers, because there is no reliable way yet to automatically identify any connection between the authors and the suggested reviewers. You are encouraged to use the internet to check if there may be a conflict of interest. My advice is never to rely solely on the comments of a suggested reviewer; a second or third opinion outside of the suggested reviewers should be always sought. We have seen a past example in which an author for another journal faked a few identities so they could review their own papers. Should you suspect any such behavior during the review process, please bring the issue to me and the publisher immediately.

Our publisher is adapting to a new rule requiring articles be published within one year of submission. This is challenging, but will be very helpful in improving our journal's impact factor. Considering that we can only publish about 20-25% of the submitted manuscripts, my strategy will be to initially screen out about 50% of the submissions. The remaining will be assigned to the editorial board, and an additional 50% rejection rate is expected in this review process. To reduce the load of the reviewer pool, you may directly reject one third of the assigned manuscripts, providing some initial evaluation of your own. In this scenario, we will ensure that about 70% of the externally reviewed manuscripts can be finally accepted for publication. Usually a higher quality paper will expect a shorter review process as many reviewers do not like to spend much time and effort on low-quality manuscripts. I expect you to have the review process completed within three months of having it assigned, extendable for one more month if revision is required. Before you recommend the acceptance of a paper to me, please have the revision and reevaluation (if needed) done.

My vision for the JEHT is straightforward: to process and review manuscript submissions in a timely fashion, to publish as swiftly as possible the results of high-quality and high-impact works, to encourage the submission of thought-provoking interpretive articles, and to invite reviews of current trends and future avenues of research from leading scholars.

Now that we've begun this challenge, we also hope to continue to evolve and develop novel ideas on how to proceed. I ask you to help me to explore new ways to make the journal better. Please share your ideas and thoughts with me frankly.

My last request is that I would like to know your intention and interest regarding remaining a member of the editorial board. If you have some other demanding obligation, feel that you might

not be able to serve the JEHT effectively, or have some other reasons, please let me know. As our publisher has indicated to me, the board can always be updated, rotated and changed. It is a continuous process.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Zhixiong Guo, Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief, J. Enhanced Heat Transfer