



ELSEVIER
MASSON

available at www.sciencedirect.com



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/cortex



Editorial

Letters to Cortex

Sergio Della Sala^{a,*} and Jordan Grafman^b

^aHuman Cognitive Neuroscience Psychology, University of Edinburgh, UK

^bCognitive Neuroscience Section, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, Bethesda, MD, USA

We are launching a new section of the journal and would like to invite the submission of *Letters to Cortex*.

These are meant to be short reports (up to 1000 words, plus one figure or table and no more than 15 references) with no abstract. These short articles will benefit from a fast track, and, if accepted following the peer-reviewing process, will be published more swiftly than full-blown research papers.

The material that will be considered under this heading include brief experiments as well as interesting and novel clinical observations. Negative reports, both single cases or group experiments, would also be very welcome. It is not the aim of this section to publish anecdotal reports or to vent an antagonistic viewpoint, hence the significance of failed replications will have to be attested. Rather by inviting the submission of negative cases, we are interested in trying to compensate for the notorious publication bias. Publication bias defines the problem that mars a literature which is not fully representative of the population of completed studies (Rothstein et al., 2005). The results of published studies will then be systematically different from those of unpublished studies (Song et al., 2000) because positive, i.e. confirmatory, findings are more likely to be published than replication

failures. Reporting data which counter the widespread publication bias is important. This is particularly true in neuropsychology, whose approach is often based on case reports of positive findings, including dissociations (Rossetti, 2003). Hence, it seems appropriate that methodologically sound negative reports should also become accessible.

In this issue, we are publishing the first of such “letters” to set the scene and as way of example. We look forward to receive your submissions.

REFERENCES

- Rossetti Y. Reports on negative findings. *Cortex*, 39: 209–210, 2003.
- Rothstein HR, Alexander J, Sutton AJ, and Borenstein M. Publication bias in meta-analysis. In Rothstein HR, Sutton AJ, and Borenstein M (Eds), *Publication Bias in Meta-Analysis – Prevention, Assessment and Adjustments*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2005: 1–7 [Chapter 1].
- Song F, Eastwood AJ, Gilbody SM, Duley L, and Sutton AJ. Publication and related biases. *Health Technology Assessment*, 4(10) [NHS, R&D, HTA Programme], 2000.

* Corresponding author. Human Cognitive Neuroscience Psychology, University of Edinburgh, 7 George Square, Edinburgh EH8 9JZ, UK. 0010-9452/\$ – see front matter © 2007 Elsevier Masson Srl. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2007.12.006