

EDITORIAL

AMS Journals Welcome Review Articles

All American Meteorological Society (AMS) journals now accept review articles. During its May 2017 meeting, the AMS Publications Commission approved a motion that all AMS journals encourage the publication of Reviews. Reviews are articles, focused on a specific topic, that synthesize previous research accomplishments, summarize the state of the science, and suggest avenues for future research. Reviews can be valuable additions to the AMS suite of publications, being often-read articles on a specialized topic that are readable for a more general audience than research articles. This Editorial describes the purpose, content, and the process of Reviews.


The purpose of a Review is summarized in an Editorial in *Monthly Weather Review* (Schultz 2008, p. 5):

Review might more properly be called literature synthesis. For students and scientists alike, many Reviews are as valuable as textbooks, albeit more current. . . . A common perception is that a Review is a quick publication, lacking new scholarship and merely summarizing previously published literature. This perception is inaccurate, for a good Review often requires more time and effort to research and write than does a regular research article. In a Review, the overarching theme should be clear. Boundaries of what will and will not be discussed should be stated explicitly early in the paper. Authors of Reviews should not be afraid to address the failures and limitations of research previously published, although fairness is imperative. Controversy is healthy in science, and all authors should dare to address these issues. In fact, the best Reviews can resolve outstanding controversies in the literature, especially if the agents of the controversy did not cleanly resolve them within their own published works. Furthermore, synthesizing the previous literature can be quite demanding as the author faces the scrutiny of all the previous authors cited—these cited authors depend on the Review to explain and cite their literature accurately.

For submission to one of the AMS journals, author(s) of prospective Reviews must submit a proposal to the target journal through Editorial Manager. The proposal will be evaluated by the journal, and feedback will be returned to the corresponding author. If submission of the full manuscript is recommended, then the corresponding author should submit a Review in the same manner as for a regular submission within a fixed time period before the proposal expires. More specifics of the process may be found on the AMS website (www.ametsoc.org/PubsReviewArticles).

Reviews must meet the high standards of AMS journals. They should be comprehensive across the discipline and not address only the authors' own work. Reviews should be well written and aspire to be highly read. Authors of prospective Reviews are encouraged to read [Boote and Beile \(2005\)](#), who provide criteria for well-written literature reviews. Section 4.7 of [Schultz \(2009\)](#), titled "Literature synthesis," also has guidance that authors may find useful as they prepare their Review.

All Reviews from the *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology* can be accessed from the journal website (www.ametsoc.org/JTECHReviewArticles). Reviews from across all AMS journals are available from the main AMS Journals Online page (www.ametsoc.org/ReviewArticles).

 Denotes content that is immediately available upon publication as open access.

Prospective authors may wish to explore these sites for examples of previously published Reviews.

For any further questions about Reviews, please contact the chief editor of the target journal.

David M. Schultz
Chair, Subcommittee on Reviews, and Chief Editor, *Monthly Weather Review*

Timothy M. DelSole
Co-Chief Editor, *Journal of Climate*

Robert M. Rauber
AMS Publications Commissioner

Walter A. Robinson
Co-Chief Editor, *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*

REFERENCES

- Boote, D. N., and P. Beile, 2005: Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educ. Res.*, **34** (6), 3–15, <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034006003>.
- Schultz, D. M., 2008: The past, present, and future of *Monthly Weather Review*. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **136**, 3–6, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2007MWR9047>.
- , 2009: *Eloquent Science: A Practical Guide to Becoming a Better Writer, Speaker, and Atmospheric Scientist*. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 440 pp.