Double Blind Peer-Review in *Games*

Ulrich Berger [1,*], Martyn Rittman [2]

Received: 18 December 2015 ; Accepted: 21 December 2015 ; Published: 24 December 2015

[1] WU Vienna, Department of Economics, Welthandelsplatz 1, 1020 Wien, Austria
[2] MDPI AG, Klybeckstrasse 64, CH-4057 Basel, Switzerland; rittman@mdpi.com
* Correspondence: ulrich.berger@wu.ac.at

Pre-publication peer-review forms the basis for how scholarly journals assess whether an article is suitable for publication. It is of paramount importance that the process is seen to be fair, robust and free of bias. One of the key methods for achieving these goals is blinding. Up until now, *Games* has used single blind peer-review, where the reviewer identities are not known to authors. This allows reviewers to submit honest opinions without the fear that their comments will be used against them in another context. Journal editors take responsibility for the final acceptance decision, taking into account the reports provided by expert reviewers in the field.

In a single blind process, however, authors may feel that they are not treated fairly. There is the suspicion that a renowned figure may be given an easy ride by reviewers, or that a young scholar is considered too inexperienced to express opinion. Influences ranging from blatant prejudice to unconscious bias should not be present in an ideal peer-review process. While we trust that our reviewers do their utmost to fulfil this aim, is it possible to do more?

We have decided to move *Games* to a double blind peer-review process. For papers submitted after 1 January 2016, reviewers will not be informed of the author names of manuscripts until a final decision has been made. We believe that this decision will reduce bias and in particular help emerging scholars to receive a fair review. We are aware that no system is perfect, and some doubts have been raised about the extent to which double blind review solves the problem of reviewer bias. However, our aim is to demonstrate a commitment to robust, independent and fair review.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank all the anonymous reviewers who contribute to the peer-review process. Their voluntary contributions, based on their experiences in the field, help us to maintain a high standard in our published papers and underpin our editorial process.