

# Editorial Complacency

**Definition:** \*Editorial complacency\* refers to a **state of stagnation or lowered critical standards within a journal’s editorial process**, often resulting in the acceptance of subpar or repetitive content due to lack of oversight, innovation, or editorial vigilance.

## Characteristics

- Routine approval of articles without rigorous peer review.
- Tolerance for poorly written, outdated, or redundant manuscripts.
- Over-reliance on habitual contributors or institutional affiliates.
- Failure to innovate in content, layout, or thematic direction.
- Lack of responsiveness to academic feedback or criticism.

## Red Flags

Symptom	Consequence
Repetitive topics and predictable formats	Reader disengagement and reduced relevance
Declining citation impact	Erosion of journal reputation
Minimal rejection rates	Signal of lax editorial scrutiny
No response to scientific controversies	Perceived bias or indifference to quality

## Consequences

- Decreased academic credibility and impact factor.
- Missed opportunities for intellectual leadership in the field.
- Disengagement of high-quality authors and reviewers.
- Risk of the journal becoming a niche echo chamber.

## Related Terms

- Editorial fatigue
- Journal stagnation
- Institutional inertia
- Peer-review degradation

## Application Example

- A journal that routinely publishes honorary reviews or fragmented historical series without critical depth may be exhibiting signs of editorial complacency, signaling a need for reform in editorial leadership and review practices.

From:

<https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/> - **Neurosurgery Wiki**

Permanent link:

[https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/doku.php?id=editorial\\_complacency](https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/doku.php?id=editorial_complacency)

Last update: **2025/06/18 10:56**

