

## Hypotheses evolving.

William Bains

Editor, HyLS. editor@hyl-ls.org

Hypotheses in the Life Sciences is entering its third year. A few things will change, a few will not.

In the first couple of years we split the annual volume into issues, in the traditional way. Journal issues originate in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century, when the earliest scientific journals were collections of papers to be circulated among what would look today like a small club, but then were all the scientists in the world. To get papers out in a timely fashion, the publishers bundled the latest into a pamphlet several times a year for posting. Many journals with hard copy versions still do this, and so we did as well just in case there was demand for HyLS as hard copy. In the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, there is no demand for hard copy, apparently, so we are dropping the division of the journal into ‘issues’.

We will also continue to try to keep the website helpful and informative for authors and readers. We hope the updates will not disturb anyone.

What will not change? We will keep the journal slim. HyLS is not vanity publishing. The hypotheses that we publish do not have to be ‘proven’, but they do need to be well-argued, clearly stated, and not obviously contradicted by basic logic or 100,000 person-years of researcher experience. If we were running this as a business, we would accept everything uncritically and keep the cash. That was not the point of HyLS at the start, and is not the point now. Authors, you have been warned: ‘Editorial review’ is not the same as ‘Unreviewed’, and I will use outside experts (yes, peer review) sometimes.

Support for this editorial review approach comes from a paper in Theoretical and Medical Ethics. The paper, authored by 198 scientists including me [1], argued that genuinely innovative science is often blocked by peer review, and shows what a bad move it was for the Elsevier journal Medical Hypotheses to abandon editorial review in favour of peer review. This is exactly the logic that led to us founding Hypotheses in the Life Sciences, and we are delighted that 197 other people agree with us.

Other achievements: We survived a continuing cybervandalism attack: we were delighted when registered user numbers rose to nearly 6000, but then found that nearly all of them were generated by some an computer, which was using the logins to post

‘comments’ on our articles that consisted of badly spelt and ungrammatical advertisements. I deleted the adverts and the users, so apologies if there really is a scientist out there called Dr. mymnboydayKam mymnboydayKam mymnboydayKam – the reason your login vanished was that I mistook you for SPAM. Apologies also if some junk slips through.

Lastly, thanks to all the authors and readers who have supported up through our first two years. Humans take a decade or more to mature to the point they can contribute usefully to adult society, journals do not mature much faster. Your support, kind readers, is very welcome. I am proud to have created HyLS. I am delighted that we continue to work with the University of Buckingham Press to keep it going.

## Reference

[1] Georg Steinhauser, G. and 198 others (2012) Peer review versus editorial review and their role in innovative science. *Theor Med Bioeth* (2012) 33:359–376.