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**Editor First Decision—Revise & Resubmit**

July 15, 2020

Dear Dr. Wei,

After review, we have reached a decision regarding your submission to Collabra: Psychology, "Issues in conservation - professional versus public perception of and attitudes towards works of art and cultural heritage in public spaces". Our decision is to request revisions of the manuscript prior to acceptance for publication.

Comments from the reviewers are included at the bottom of this email. Based on these comments, we ask that you make the following major revisions to the paper:

Reviewer A's report is rather verbose. We request that you consider all of the comments, but in particular, please pay attention to the following requests for revisions:
- Clarify the purpose of the paper.
- Work on flow from one section of the paper to the other; make sure to proof and correct grammar/communication issues
- Clarify how you obtained the data for the study. Were the data specifically collected for this study or were data from other studies repurposed to serve this study?
- Provide some kind of explanation to explain why the specific works of art you’ve addressed were examined.
- Address the specific items mentioned for each of the studies.
- Address the issues about objectivity that the reviewer discusses.
- Make sure to describe how human subjects have been protected in your study. The reviewer is very much correct that inclusion of children in the study mandates this kind of protection.

Reviewer G is more succinct. Please address all the changes that this reviewer is requesting.

Make sure to use MS Word's track changes feature when you make changes to your manuscript. Include an additional file explaining the changes you have made in your revised submission.

To access your submission account, follow the below instructions:
1) login to the journal webpage with username and password
2) click on the submission title
3) click 'Review' menu option
4) download Reviewed file and make revisions based on review feedback
5) upload the edited file
6) Click the 'notify editor' icon and email the confirmation of re-submission and any relevant comments to the journal.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please contact us.

If possible, please have the revisions submitted by July 28, 2020. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jeremy C. Wells
University of Maryland
jcwells@umd.edu

------------------------------------------------------
Reviewer A:

1) General comments and summary of recommendation
Describe your overall impressions and your recommendation, including changes or revisions. Please note that you should pay attention to scientific, methodological, and ethical soundness only, not novelty, topicality, or scope. A checklist of things to you may want to consider is below:
 - Are the methodologies used appropriate?
 - Are any methodological weaknesses addressed?
 - Is all statistical analysis sound?
 - Does the conclusion (if present) reflect the argument, is it supported by data/facts?
 - Is the article logically structured, succinct, and does the argument flow coherently?
 - Are the references adequate and appropriate?:
I’ll start by saying that this is a particularly interesting article, in part because it is quite far afield of the things that I usually review. I’ll put out there at the front that I’m not in the arts, and to my understanding was brought on to this review to give a perspective on the survey methods utilized by the authors. While I’ll thus try to focus on that, I also potentially serve as a relatively naïve reader, and realistically even a member of the public that your work is attempting to solicit the input of.

I’ll start somewhat big picture, then talk about the data specifically, then talk more broadly about the areas that are less of my expertise, in that order. As such, I would thus allow the editors of this paper to view every additional sentence of my review with somewhat reduced importance, if they so desire.

I have two big picture issues, one of purpose, and one of flow.

I’ve read this paper a few times, and keep trying to ask myself what the purpose of the paper is, and/or what the reader should be taking new away from it. Cynically, I might be able to make the case that your argument is ‘experts get in the way and we don’t need them’, but I’m not sure that’s what you’re going for. I might also say it’s that ‘the views of the public on art are simplistic, and lack nuance’, another thing that I’m not sure you’re going for, or even ‘public art is getting old and no one seems to care and we think they should but they don’t so…’, or ‘the curatorship of public art should be bottom up and not top down’? Maybe it’s just that art experts should talk to the public more often? I’m not sure a very strong case can be made for that, given your case studies.

I walk away with the question of who the audience of this paper is, and I think it’s fair to say that the audience is art professionals who want to make policy decisions? Again, I’m not entirely sure, which itself makes things fairly tricky in terms of figuring what the reader should be walking away with. I think that spending some time clearly thinking about the purpose of this paper and then making sure that’s the purpose the reader walks away with would be well spent.

Also as a big picture issue, I think there are some notable problems with the flow of this paper that make it seem a bit jarring in places. Part of this dovetails with the above, in that what I think I’m reading at different points feels like it’s attempting to make different points to the reader. It feels as if different parts of the paper were written to serve different agendas, and that might be why I feel like I’m getting lost in a sea of potential takeaways.

The jump into the case studies, and then the departure from them also feels jarring, particularly since there are more examples that are brought up in the discussion that aren’t talked about with these earlier examples. The case for why the case studies are important, what they are, etc would be well suited to lead into that section. Each case study also feels fairly modular, as if they’re simple descriptions of projects that fit into these places but don’t really move the flow of the paper forward. They read as if they’re things you have to talk about but you don’t really want to.

I mentioned just now the other non case study case studies (e.g., Koons, Pesce), and I was left wondering if I had just missed something earlier when they came up. It does seem that if you’re going to use them as examples that they should be discussed the same as any other, or they should be used as secondary examples and not included in table 3.

My last point about flow is one that I want to say with a caveat, as I don’t like to nitpick language, particularly as a native English speaking American with only minimal fluency in other languages. I recognize that the journal will likely employ a copy editor to clean up some minor errors, things like comma placement, small missing or extraneous wording, but there are a few places where I simply wasn’t sure what was being said, and thus assume that a copy editor would have trouble streamlining things as well without guessing at your intent.

I didn’t take note of all of these, but two quick examples are right near the front, and both center around lists (also, you should make your lists in the same consistent format, as these two list formats are different).

There is a paragraph that starts with ‘The authors conducting research on public perception…’, and while I might say that needs to be ‘conducted’, the next sentence also more explicitly uses the present tense but also leads into a list in a way that makes no sense: ‘The research is being conducted <list break> 1) Formal surveys and semi-formal interviews are conducted…’

This paragraph and list just needs a lot of work, as while I again don’t want to critique language here, this is hard to get anything out of. The other example is in the next list, and while that setup makes a bit more sense, there are a lot of things going on in point 2 and 3. For instance, ‘Surveys of residents in an artists’ project on the future of the Amstelpark in Amsterdam, The Netherlands’ has a whole lot of directional words that point all over the place, and I had to read it a few times to not think it was about residents that were a part of an artists’ project. Maybe it is. Anyway, these sorts of things broke the flow for me throughout the paper, and so it would pay to really read this deeply from front to back thinking about where the narrative of the paper is going at each step.

Okay. Those are the big picture things, now onto the data.

I walked away from the first read of this paper still quite unsure if this was a primary data collection, or something else. It’s only the ‘data accessibility statement’ that gives me even a bit of information on this, and that shouldn’t really be the case. (Also, a quick aside, the inclusion of the word ‘reasonable’ in the ‘All data are available upon [reasonable] request from…’ statement is ridiculous, and shouldn’t be there, unless the journal made you say it that way, in which case the journal is being ridiculous, and perhaps should rethink the meaning of words and the importance of words vis a vis scientific responsibility.)

It should be clear if these data were collected for this paper, or were secondary source data that just happened to be on hand. There should also be some rationale as to why these data, and not something else. Why are these works of art being examined? There’s perhaps a wording difference here, as if you just treated these as ‘examples’ instead of ‘case studies’ I might have had less issue.

This question is particularly important, as if these data collections, in particular, are things that have been reported elsewhere, and the authors are just reporting on them, then issues with those data collections can be discussed here, but are at the end of the day the responsibility of the original authors. Limitations can be discussed here, but the data are already out there.

If this is the first place these data are being reported, then those problems fall to these authors to discuss and explain. My assumption is that these are primary reports of studies, so that’s what I’ll use here.

I also want to start by saying that I’m not sure what qualifies as good research in this area, or if that’s really a valid statement to start with. You’re at the very least not making inferences, but there still are a lot of problems (above and beyond the earlier question of why just these few pieces of art?). The question at the end of the day is: what story are these data being used to tell? If you frame that well, and frame that in a way that is more of an existence proof than a systematic study of the perceptions of the public, then your requirements for rigor are somewhat reduced.

That said, I’m likely to sound fairly brutal here for a bit, and to minimize the time you have to put up with me being so, I’m going to just run through it as bullet points. I will leave those points to the editors to decide whether or not they are justified in this context or not.

Study 1

1) You only did this for four hours on a Sunday. People walking around Queens on a Sunday afternoon are much more likely to be tourists or from other parts of the city than if you’d done this on say, a Tuesday morning, which could easily account for more people not recognizing the mural than you might expect on other days/times. In that way, your sample is hardly representative of the local public. Presumably you could get at some of that (only a little bit) from the question about if they’re residents, but you didn’t seem to use that at all.
2) What proportion of individuals’ demographic information was estimated vs asked? You mention that not all subjects were asked about this, and that limits what you can get from those demographics. That said, what are you trying to get out of the demographic information, anyway? It doesn’t seem to move the narrative much other than a statement like ‘age was normally distributed from x to y, x percent of respondents were male/female, and the majority of participants were white.’
3) It’s not at all important to note that ‘senior citizens’ participated, as that’s fairly bad optics from a wording standpoint. ‘Senior citizens’ are still people. It is important to note that children under 18 participated, as that raises all sorts of questions. Were they with someone, or just randomly roaming around Queens? Were groups of people allowed to participate (e.g., a child and their guardian)? If so, were they separated first, or asked questions at the same time by an interviewer (thus invalidating the independence of their data)?
4) You don’t talk about it, but I’d assume that one of the checks the journal will make is whether or not you met some reasonable criteria for using human subjects data in this way – that is, whether this was IRB approved, why it didn’t need to be, etc. This is especially true since some of the respondents were children, which in and of itself demands an entirely different level of ethical consideration.
5) A point is made about leading questions, and trying to avoid that, but this whole ‘conversational approach’ is a minefield of leading the subject, at least from a psychological standpoint. You talked to people for a while, built a rapport, talked about art, pointed out art (if they didn’t know the art, pointed it out in a way that was potentially disarming, as they were now shown not to have noticed something right there), and then asked if they thought it was good art or should be preserved. It’s not surprising no one had anything bad to say, but it’s also not telling to the things you’re trying to uncover.
6) I’m not sure what I should be getting out of table 2, and it also feels very incomplete. Of the 106 people, 18 are represented. What did the remainder say in response to the recognition question? How many said no? Were there any that just didn’t get that question, or said other things?

Study 3
1) What is the response rate for this survey? This is certainly hard to estimate, as you likely have multiple people in each house that saw the flyer, but in general I’d be happy with a ratio of how many people responded vs how many fliers were put in doors.
2) I’m again struck with the question of ‘what are you trying to get out of these data?’ You say there’s a difference between those who want activities and go to the activity part of the park, and those that like the plants and animals and hang out in the plants and animals part of the park. There’s discrepancy between these groups, and one group spends their time complaining about the other. How does this move the purpose of this paper? Why do I care? Why is it important?
3) In addition to the last point, you sort of make a point that no one talked about art, but you also say you designed the survey to not be about art, and really just about the park itself. It’s a park preference survey, so people gave you feedback about the park. It doesn’t mean that they don’t view it as art (or cultural heritage), but rather that they answered the questions that you gave them. It’s not their fault that you didn’t ask them about the things that you care about.
4) Also, I should say that as a naïve reader, I’m left wondering myself why the park is considered art or a cultural heritage site, other than a sort of throwaway line at the front about it being a place that 17th century rich people went to get away from 17th century poor people (with the unspoken subtext that regarding cultural heritage this happened while other 17th century rich people committed cultural atrocities around the globe). If that’s the case you’re making for the important ‘cultural heritage’ of this park, then it’s not really surprising that no one gives two shits about it. There might be other important things the park is known for, but that’s very lost on someone not from Amsterdam (although it also appears lost on people who are actually literally next to the park, so who knows). Maybe this is the point, though, as you make a point later that ‘professionals in the field…consider every object important’ – maybe this one isn’t? Convince me one way or the other.

To move to the discussion, I’m left wondering if this is really the paper you wanted to write. This is where the flow picks back up, and while you cite things and use examples, it reads much more like the opinion piece that this is. It reads like a piece setting out an argument and moving through that argument focusing on evidence and moving on. I sort of feel that I pick up most of the story here, which is tricky. Again, this might be a difference in the way of writing by field, but my general rule of thumb is that nothing new should be introduced in a discussion section. That might be different in this field, though.

I wonder if there’s a way to simply work these examples more into a singular flowing piece that doesn’t break away to discuss them only to come back to discuss them in the discussion. I think this goes back to my earlier point about flow, and the challenge of maintaining a consistent narrative throughout the piece.

I also wonder if these are the best examples to use here, though this again might go back to my confusion about the purpose of the paper or the point of each example. I think the ‘Loerbol’ example maybe gives one of the better points of discussion to some of your points, that people don’t even realize they have art until someone threatens to take it away. That’s contradictory to the ‘De Aardschotel’ example, though, where a Karen convinced the public that they didn’t want this piece to be art, for worry that it would attract ‘youths’.

That said, maybe the point is as you state after those two examples, that professional expectation of how something might go isn’t always how it goes. While that works for these two examples, how does that relate to the mural or the park?

The value moment aspect is also quite interesting, but I’m again left wanting to have seen it earlier in the paper, or to understand how it is in service to the bigger picture purpose of the paper. Why is it here, why is it important? Is this the main thread of the paper? If so, then again I’d argue it needs to be put out there earlier to give the reader that context before the examples, not after.

I think there are some interesting data in this paper, and I think that you’re making cases for a number of concepts. Perhaps my main critique, then, goes back to my first point about purpose, and focus. It would seem, at least to me, that you have a number of purposes as you work through this paper. It may be that you can tie these together better, or that trimming some of these examples helps to streamline the focus of each area of the paper in service of those larger points. It may also be that there are several smaller points that are all part of a larger point that isn’t discussed explicitly, and could tie things together if it was.

To wrap things up even though I maybe feel like my last paragraph is a better ending, you have a lot of paragraphs that feel like better endings, but then you keep going after they’re complete. Put another way, you have a bunch of false endings, and I think it’s also tied into this lack of focus. Without a clear start and purpose, it’s hard to tell when the paper should end. It’s hard to tell when you’ve said the things you need to say to make the point, because there are too many points that all need to be wrapped up. Certainly, the last paragraph doesn’t feel like a final paragraph, and it raises a whole other issue in terms of tastes and preferences driving decision making (a fairly obvious conclusion) – a point that really has little to do with anything in the paper up to that point. Additionally, bringing in these ‘Socratic Dialogs’ – more commonly known as ‘discussions’ - also muddles your point and works directly against one of the themes you’re trying to work on.

I keep going back to one part of the abstract, because the abstract forces you to do what I’m essentially suggesting here. You state that: “These findings illustrate the need to incorporate public perception and ownership in decisions on the preservation of cultural heritage. However, the responses indicate how challenging this will be if heritage professionals are not aware of, or willing to think about and accept as valid, public feelings about art and cultural heritage in their neighborhoods.” In absence of everything else, that feels like a concrete takeaway from this paper, though even these two sentences are differentially supported by the evidence in the paper.

Again, despite what may seem like fairly harsh critique here at times, I do think there are interesting things this paper is attempting to say. Perhaps my best advice (that I will fail myself to take in this review) is to edit, cut, and focus. Find the things that you want to say, and say them without the distraction of lots of other things.

2) Figures/tables/data availability:
Please comment on the author’s use of tables, charts, figures, ifrelevant. Please acknowledge that adequate underlying data is available to ensure reproducibility (see open data policies per discipline of Collabra here).:
The tables and figures are fine, though see comments above about whether or not they're necessary, or if there is other data needed to make them more robust.

3) Ethical approval:
If humans or animals have been used as research subjects, and/or tissue or field sampling, are the necessary statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.
If not, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement/follow-up is required.:
As noted above, it didn't seem that these studies were conducted under any regulatory approval, but it was also unclear if these studies were conducted by the authors, so...¯\\_(ツ)\_/¯

That said, I think it's important for the journal to follow up on this to clarify things before any other decisions are made on the paper.

4) Language:
Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and any need for improvement beyond the scope of this process.:
I make a note about this above, but there are a number of basic grammar errors that would be easily caught by a copy editor, but also some larger ones that pretty badly obscure what the authors might be trying to say.
------------------------------------------------------
Reviewer G:

1) General comments and summary of recommendation
Describe your overall impressions and your recommendation, including changes or revisions. Please note that you should pay attention to scientific, methodological, and ethical soundness only, not novelty, topicality, or scope. A checklist of things to you may want to consider is below:
 - Are the methodologies used appropriate?
 - Are any methodological weaknesses addressed?
 - Is all statistical analysis sound?
 - Does the conclusion (if present) reflect the argument, is it supported by data/facts?
 - Is the article logically structured, succinct, and does the argument flow coherently?
 - Are the references adequate and appropriate?:
The article examines public perceptions in relation to three case studies. Such studies are relevant and needed in heritage studies. I suggest to accept the manuscript with major revision. Main concerns are:
--Lack of definition for culturall heritage and many concepts used in the manuscript
--Use of different concepts without proper definition, such as perception, awareness, feelings, sense of ownership, place attachment, etc.
--The method needs to be presented in a systematic way. Researchers chose to 'estimate' socio-demographic info but I believe they had permission to interview people--so it is hard to follow some steps in the data collection.
--Rationate for selecting these works of art/heritage examples needs to be presented. The last case, refers to parks in two different cultural contexts--and are very different from the other cases. These 3 cases are not well integrated in the discussion and conclusion.
--In the conclusion, one wonders what can be taken from all these examples in terms of comparison and practice. --Suggestions for heritage management are not presented. The authors refer to the role of an 'expert adviser'. How different is it from the role of a self-appointed adviser and how it may lead to good practive and integration in heritage studies--particularly when conflict arises?
--Procedure for undertaking interviews, coding, and analysing data needs to be re-written. If authors are following Lynch's method, then we need to know exactly how it helped with the analysis of the data. Actually, I don't understand why you decided to refer to Lynch as his method in fact, is a very common way of doing research in the social sciences. You have not used Lynch's major concepts, such as city imageability, for example.
--What is the theoretical framework structuring the paper? Several concepts are mentioned as well as a 3-step value model (which I found contrdictory with the main argument to empower the public) but the conclusion is very brief and not well integrated.
--The language needs to be revised as well as general statements used throughout the paper-- without presenting evidence or appropriate references (only 14 refs)
--The ojectives need to be clearly stated in page 2 (see word doc)
--You need to make clear what is the function of a work of art--as there are several instances when you mention 'bringing back to being a work of art'. Also, you refer to people making a planter out of a work of art and then "erasing its function as a work of art". Aren't people emppowering themselves and the community by appropriating the work of art and enhancing greenery in their neighbourhoods?

2) Figures/tables/data availability:
Please comment on the author’s use of tables, charts, figures, ifrelevant. Please acknowledge that adequate underlying data is available to ensure reproducibility (see open data policies per discipline of Collabra here).:
I could not see some details of the works presented, such as Haas' mosaic. The tables are not useful as the information can be easily summarised into words.

3) Ethical approval:
If humans or animals have been used as research subjects, and/or tissue or field sampling, are the necessary statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.
If not, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement/follow-up is required.:
A sentence can be added stating that written consent from participants have been received to undertake the interviews.

4) Language:
Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and any need for improvement beyond the scope of this process.:
The language needs to be greatly improved. See my detailed comments in the word doc.

**Author Response**

August 13, 2020

Dear Editors,
I have submitted the revisions to our article on the Collabra website. Please note that we have slightly changed the title in response to reviewer A, and the original Fig. 2 has been removed.

The track change version is the main submission. In the supplementary section, I have submitted the explanation of the changes we made, a "clean" version, and the five remaining figures with their new numbers. (Fig. 3 also has a circle added.)

I you require anything further please let me know.

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our paper.

Yours,
Bill

Dr. W. (Bill) Wei
Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands
Amsterdam
b.wei@cultureelerfgoed.nl

Original title: Issues in conservation - professional versus public perception of and attitudes towards works of art and cultural heritage in public spaces

**New title:** Issues in conservation – three value moments in the public perception of cultural heritage objects in public spaces

W. Wei, H. Heerema, R. Rushfeld and I. van der Lee

Explanation of revisions

We appreciate the time that the reviewers A and G took to look at and comment on our paper. It was nice to read the reviewer A found our paper interesting since it is not something he/she normally sees and we appreciate the very detailed comments. Reviewer G also found the case studies useful. Most of the comments by both reviewers were correct and we have strongly revised the paper as recommended to reflect those comments. This does make it a bit difficult to state specifically where all of the detailed changes are because many sentences and paragraphs have been moved, some material cut, and some rewritten.

This document first answers the summary of reviewer A’s comments by Dr. Wells and then those those of reviewer G. In particular, we took to heart reviewer A’s summary suggestion to “edit, cut, and focus”. We believe that we have also answered all of the detailed comments by reviewer A, but have added a few specific explanations to be sure.

We note that both reviewers mentioned putting comments in the WORD document of th epaper. However, we could not find these on the editing website. The document which was uploaded with reviewer comments was only our original paper.

Explanation of changes based on Reviewer A comments as summarized by Dr. Wells:

1. The objective of the paper is now focused on the “Three value moments” which was originally only mentioned in the discussion. This is now the main theme and is thus introduced in the abstract and introduction, as well as in the rest of the text. Note that we have slightly change the title as well to reflect this theme. The audience for the “big picture” as reviewer A puts it are cultural heritage professionals, who should listen to the public more, para- or rephrasing Reviewer A’s question on what the audience should get out of this paper.

2. With that main objective, we have changed and improved the work flow of the paper. We have now combined the questions over where the data came from and why the three specific objects chosen in a methodology section. This is then followed by a results section organized the same way according to the three objects/case studies. This breaks up our original flowing text which was hard to follow, into sections which we think improve the work flow and make it clear what we were doing and are now saying.

3. We note in different wording, that the data is ours, that is, primary data which we obtained ourselves.

4. We have added information on how we worked with respondents in the two case studies (mosaic, Amstelpark) in order to answer the concerns of working with human subjects. As reviewer A noted, the demographic information actually does not contribute to the paper, but we clearly state that the respondents cannot be identified and results cannot be attributed to any respondent. Note that only three children were asked and that was through the parents who were respondents. However, the children’s answers also do not contribute to the paper so we have not included them either.

5. The writing was admittedly not particularly clean. We hope to now have cleared up the English.

Explanation of changes based on Reviewer G:

We believe that our changes made to cover the general aspects of Reviewer A’s comments clarify the questions brought up by Reviewer G, except for Reviewer G’s

6. comment on the techniques used by Lynch. We have removed those as they only dealt with a small group of respondents, and is, indeed a different line of research which now does not fit into the current flow of the paper.

7. comment on general statements with a low number of appropriate references. We do not know which general statements the reviewer refers to, though we feel that the ones we made are common knowledge and do not need to be referenced. Further, as an opinion paper in a new area, there is not that much literature specific to this paper to be referenced.

Explanation of changes based on several specific Reviewer A comments:

We think that we have covered most of the specific details in Reviewer A’s detailed review. To make sure, we comment on a few points where this might not be as obvious:

8. We have chosen to remain with the term “case studies”, as the word “example” posed in Reviewer A’s suggestion would be too weak for what we had done. We think that it is now clearer that the three objects chosen were more than just “examples” of what we wanted to say.

9. We have removed the “non-case study case studies (e.g. Koons, Pesce)” from what is now Table 2, as this contributed to the confusion as to whether our data was primary or not. Those cases are briefly mentioned in the text in the discussion section.

10. For the mosaic study, we have removed the word “conversational” from the mosaic case study methodology, which indeed can be confusing when discussing methodologies. What was meant is what is now written, that we did not simply use a checklist and rattle off the questions.

11. In the Amstelpark study results, we have given the number of responses and the total number of survey links distributed by hand.

12. As mentioned above, we have focused the text so that there is now just one ending.

**Editor Final Decision—Accept**

March 23, 2021

Dear Dr. Wei,

After review, we have reached a decision regarding your submission to Collabra: Psychology, "Issues in conservation - professional versus public perception of and attitudes towards works of art and cultural heritage in public spaces", and are happy to accept your submission for publication, pending the completion of copyediting and formatting processes.

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point. The accepted submission will now undergo final copyediting. You will be contacted once this is complete to answer any queries that may have arisen during copyediting and to allow a final chance to edit the files prior to typesetting. If you wish to view your submission during this time, you can log in via the journal website.

Kind regards,

Dr. Jeremy C. Wells
University of Maryland
jcwells@umd.edu