

The Python Papers



Volume 4, Issue3

December 2009

www.pythonpapers.org

ISSN: 1834-3147

Journal Information

The Python Papers

ISSN: 1834-3147

Editors

Co-Editors-in-Chief: Maurice Ling
Tennessee Leeuwenburg
Associate Editors: Andreas Schreiber
Guilherme Polo
Guy Kloss
Richard Jones
Mike Dewhirst
Sarah Mount
Stephanie Chong
Editorial Reviewers: Jacob Kaplan-Moss
Raymond Hettinger

Referencing Information

Articles from this edition of this journal may be referenced as follows :
Author , “Title” (2009) The Python Papers , Volume N, Issue M, Article Number

Copyright Information

© Copyright 2009 The Python Papers and the individual authors
This work is copyright under the Creative Commons 2.5 license subject to
Attribution, Non-commercial and Share- Alike conditions. The full legal code may
be found at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/byncsa/2.1/au/>
The Python Papers was first published in 2006 in Melbourne, Australia.

Referees

An academic peer-review was performed on all academic articles
in accordance to The Python Papers Anthology Editorial Policy .
The reviewers will be acknowledge individually but their identities
will not be released in order to ensure the anonymity.

Focus and Scope

- Python User Groups and Special Interest Group introductions
- Technical aspects of the Python language
- Code reviews and book reviews
- Descriptions of new Python modules and libraries
- Solutions to specific problems in Python
- Consolidated summaries of current discussion in Python
- Mailing lists or other forum
- Companies and organisations using Python
- Applications developed in Python (such as held in the Python Cheese Shop)

In short , we are soliciting submissions where Python is an integral part of the
answer.

The Python Papers Anthology Editorial Policy

0. Preamble

The Python Papers Anthology is the umbrella entity referring to The Python Papers (ISSN 1834-3147), The Python Papers Monograph (ISSN under application) and The Python Papers Source Codes (ISSN 1836-621X), under a common editorial committee (hereafter known as 'editorial board'). It aims to be a platform for disseminating industrial / trade and academic knowledge about Python technologies and its applications.

The Python Papers is intended to be both an industrial journal as well as an academic journal, in the sense that the editorial board welcomes submissions relating to all aspects of the Python programming language, its tools and libraries, and community, both of academic and industrial inclinations. The Python Papers aims to be a publication for the Python community at large. In order to cater for this, The Python Papers seeks to publish submissions under two main streams: the industrial stream (technically reviewed) and the academic stream (peer-reviewed).

The Python Papers Monograph provides a refereed format for publication of monograph-length reports including dissertations, conference proceedings, case studies, advanced-level lectures, and similar material of theoretical or empirical importance. All volumes published under The Python Papers Monograph will be peer-reviewed and external reviewers may be named in the publication.

The Python Papers Source Codes provides a refereed format for publication of software and source codes which are usually associated with papers published in The Python Papers and The Python Papers Monograph. All publications made under The Python Papers Source Codes will be peer-reviewed.

This policy statement seeks to clarify the processes of technical review and peer-review in The Python Papers Anthology.

1. Composition and roles of the editorial board

The editorial board is headed by the Editor-in-Chief or Co-Editors-in-Chief (hereafter known as "EIC"), assisted by Associate Editors (hereafter known as "AE") and Editorial Reviewers (hereafter known as "ER").

EIC is the chair of the editorial board and together with AEs, manages the strategic and routine operations of the periodicals. ER is a tier of editors deemed to have in-depth expertise knowledge in specialized areas. As members of the editorial board, ERs are accorded editorial status but are generally not involved in the strategic and routine operations of the periodicals although their expert opinions may be sought at the discretion of EIC.

2. Right of submission author(s) to choose streams

The submission author(s); that is, the author(s) of the article or code or any submissions in any other forms deemed by the editorial board as being suitable; reserves the right to choose if he/she wants his/her submission to be in the industrial stream, where it will be technically reviewed, or in the academic stream, where it will be peer-reviewed. It is also the onus of the submission author(s) to nominate the stream. The editorial board defaults all submissions to be industrial (technical

review) in event of non-nomination by the submission author(s) but the editorial board reserves the right to place such submissions into the academic stream if it deems fit.

The editorial board also reserves the right to place submissions nominated for the academic stream in the technical stream if it deems fit.

3. Right of submission author(s) to nominate potential reviewers

The submission author(s) can exercise the right to nominate up to 4 potential reviewers (hereafter known as "external reviewer") for his/her submission if the submission author(s) choose to be peer-reviewed. When this right is exercised, the submission author(s) must declare any prior relationships or conflict of interests with the nominated potential reviewers. The final decision to accept the nominated reviewer(s) rests with the Chief Reviewer (see section 5 for further information on the role of the Chief Reviewer).

4. Right of submission author(s) to exclude potential reviewers

The submission author(s) can exercise the right to recommend excluding any reasonable numbers of potential reviewers for his/her submission. When this right is exercised, the submission author(s) must indicate the grounds on which such exclusion should be recommended. Decisions for the editorial board to accept or reject such exclusions will be solely based on the grounds as indicated by the submission author(s).

5. Peer-review process

Upon receiving a submission for peer-review, the Editor-in-Chief (hereafter known as "EIC") may choose to reject the submission or the EIC will nominate a Chief Reviewer (hereafter known as "CR") from the editorial board to chair the peer-review process of that submission. The EIC can nominate himself/herself as CR for the submission.

The CR will send out the submission to TWO or more external reviewers to be reviewed. The CR reserves the right not to call upon the nominated potential reviewers and/or to call upon any of the reviewers nominated for exclusion by the submission author(s). The CR may also concurrently send the submission to one or more Associate Editor(s) (hereafter known as "AE") for review. Hence, a submission in the academic stream will be reviewed by at least three persons, the CR and two external reviewers. Typically, a submission may be reviewed by three to four persons: the EIC as CR, an AE, and two external reviewers. There is no upper limit to the number of reviews in a submission.

Upon receiving the review from external reviewer(s) and/or AE(s), the CR decides on one of the following options: accept without revision, accept with revision or reject; and notifies the submission author(s) of the decision on behalf of the EIC. If the decision is "accept with revision", the CR will provide a deadline to the submission author(s) for revisions to be done and will automatically accept the revised submission if the CR deems that all revision(s) were done; however, the CR reserves the right to move to reject the original submission if the revision(s) were not carried out by the stipulated deadline by the CR. If the decision is "reject", the submission author(s) may choose to revise for future re-submission. Decision(s) by CR or EIC are final.

6. Technical review process

Upon receiving a submission for technical review, the Editor-in-Chief (hereafter known as "EIC") may choose to reject the submission or the EIC will nominate a Chief Reviewer (hereafter known as ";;;CR";;;) from the editorial board to chair the review process of that submission. The EIC can nominate himself/herself as CR for the submission.

The CR may decide to accept or reject the submission after reviewing or may seek another AE's opinions before reaching a decision. The CR will notify the submission author(s) of the decision on behalf of the EIC. Decision(s) by CR or EIC is final.

7. Main difference between peer-review and technical review

The process of peer-review and technical review are similar, with the main difference being that in the peer review process, the submission is reviewed both internally by the editorial board and externally by external reviewers (nominated by submission author(s) and/or nominated by EIC/CR). In a technical review process, the submission is reviewed by the editorial board. The editorial board retains the right to additionally undertake an external review if it is deemed necessary.

8. Umbrella philosophy

The Python Papers Anthology editorial board firmly believes that all good (technically and/or scholarly/academic) submissions should be published when appropriate and that the editorial board is integral to refining all submissions. The board believes in giving good advice to all submission author(s) regardless of the final decision to accept or reject and hopes that advice to rejected submissions will assist in their revisions.

Statement on Copyright and Open Access

The Python Papers Anthology has received a number of inquiries relating to the republishing of articles from the journal, especially in the context of open-access repositories. Each issue of *The Python Papers Anthology* is released under a Creative Commons 2.5 license, subject to Attribution, Non-commercial and Share-Alike clauses. This, in short, provides a *carte blanche* on republishing articles, so long as the source of the article is fully attributed, the article is not used for commercial purposes and that the article is republished under this same license. Creative commons permits both republishing in full and also the incorporation of portions of *The Python Papers Anthology* in other works. A portion may be an article, quotation or image. This means (a) that content may be freely re-used and (b) that other works using *The Python Papers Anthology* content must be available under the same Creative Commons license.

The remainder of this article will address some of the details that might be of interest to anyone who wishes to include issues or articles in a database, website, hard copy collection or any other alternative access mechanism. The full legal code of the license may be found at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/byncsa/2.5/au/>

Archiving Articles in Open-Access Repositories

The Python Papers Anthology was asked about the official policy towards authors archiving their journal articles into open-access repositories, especially institutional repositories. We believe it is clear from the distribution license that this is clearly permitted. The exception would be in the case that the open-access repository is run for-profit. *The Python Papers Anthology* general position is that the journal is operated on the principle of promoting general access and any reasonably open-access repository should be well within its rights to make use of content from the journal. If there are any doubts, it is recommended that publishers contact either the author in question or the journal itself.

If the general license is not compatible with the goals of any particular open-access repository, we would encourage publishers to contact us to organise special permission.

Drafts, pre-prints, post-prints and other alternative versions of articles

Authors will typically produce a number of drafts or revisions prior to the final, accepted version of their paper. On occasion, authors will wish to publish these drafts or revisions for a variety of purposes.

The editors of *The Python Papers Anthology* need to be sure that drafts and alternative versions - which may or may not be decorated with a Creative Commons licence and/or reference to *The Python Papers Anthology* - cannot be confused with the final, approved version we published. The license under which each issue is released *covers only the final, approved version*. Especially for academic papers, *The Python Papers Anthology* believes it is inappropriate for article pre-prints to be published as though they had met the academic review process. As such, we would be unlikely to give permission for authors submitting academic papers to publish a draft, pre-print or revision of the final version. Articles which are submitted as non-

academic are not subject to the same peer-review standards, but published articles are still a reflection of the standard of *The Python Papers Anthology* as a whole. Permission may be specially granted in some cases, but we require authors and other publishers to contact us on a case-by-case basis.

This decision does not relate to whether the use is commercial or non-commercial, but rather reflects the high standards that *The Python Papers Anthology* requires from its authors. Some of the articles in *The Python Papers Anthology* are based on articles which have already been published to the web. A common example is where we have invited a blog author to expand on an interesting entry. Our requirements only cover the article as published in each issue.

What kinds of repositories may use content from The Python Papers?

The Python Papers Anthology has been asked to clarify whether its position on article re-use is different for university institutional repositories, personal websites, or other repositories. Any institution may include abstracts and meta-information in their databases. However, they may not necessarily be able to hold actual copies of *The Python Papers Anthology*. This provides an alternative for any institution which does not meet the requirements of our distribution license. Such institutions may provide searchable information to their users, with a link to download the content directly from the *The Python Papers Anthology* website.

Any repository which is not run on a commercial basis may freely and without special permission use content from *The Python Papers Anthology*. This may include a university institutional repository, if that repository does not operate on a commercial basis. If, however, the institution requires a payment before content may be accessed, they are **not** permitted to use content from *The Python Papers Anthology*.

The same principle applies to personal websites - so long as that website is not operated on a commercial basis, authors may freely include content from *The Python Papers Anthology*.

Repositories which do not meet those requirements, or which are not certain of their status, are encouraged to contact *The Python Papers Anthology* for clarification.