

## Editor's Note

NIELS CHR. HANSEN

Royal Academy of Music Aarhus/Aalborg, Denmark  
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

DANIEL MÜLLENSIEFEN

Goldsmiths, University of London, UK

EVER since its beginning in 2004, *Empirical Musicology Review* has pioneered an innovative editorial format where target articles not only undergo rigorous peer review, but also are published alongside open peer commentaries written by some of the same colleagues who authored an internal peer review. Reviewers are granted an opportunity to, first, suggest revisions to the submitted text in a conventional review report, and, next, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, to share original commentary with the journal's interdisciplinary readership. We editors believe this approach reflects the cumulative nature of scientific discovery processes where researchers pay gratitude to their intellectual predecessors, and where collegial debates both advance state of the art and serve as an educational training ground for the next generation of empirical musicologists. Our editorial policy aligns with—but also goes beyond—the tenets of Open Research by offering recognition of reviewers' contribution in terms of a citable publication.

There are innumerable ways of writing a good open peer commentary for EMR, and Vol. 19(2) provides a wide variety of great examples. The target article by **Friedman, Song, and Cox** is in some regards a scholarly commentary of its own. They respond directly to a recent study by Clemente et al. (2021) who, surprisingly, found no correlation within individuals between aesthetic sensitivity to the stimulus complexity of musical melodies and of geometric figures. Using dynamic light displays and static texture patterns, Friedman et al. find modest, but reliable, cross-modal associations. Both commentators concur that, despite its merits, neither study provides a definitive answer to the posed research question. **Kozbelt** argues that cross-modal surface similarities provide no evidence of shared evolutionary origins and that constructs like complexity, balance, and symmetry can and should be operationalized in multifarious ways. Diverse operationalizations naturally lead to diverse outcomes. **Clemente** exemplifies this by distinguishing between feature- and information-based complexity metrics and further points to neuroscience findings speaking against neural implementations of a general, modality-independent preference for complexity. This scholarly interchange with the lead author of the original study brilliantly demonstrates the advantages of transparent review procedures. Readers of other journals using conventional editorial procedures would have been unaware of this debate.

**De Souza, Dvorsky, and Oyon** assess onset synchrony in string quartets by Viennese classical composers to test music theorists' assertions that development sections and transitions exhibit more contrapuntal textures than expositions and thematic sub-sections, respectively. The results are consistent with the former hypothesis, but not the latter. **Tsai** revisits the findings through the exploration-exploitation framework and proposes that expert evaluations may refine score-based metrics of polyphony. **Hall** views perception of polyphony as auditory stream segregation and points to pertinent examples—e.g., distributed accompaniment, tacet, and tremoli—where such metrics evidently fail.

The third target article by **Buechele, Cooke, and Berezovsky** illustrates how operating in a radically interdisciplinary research field such as empirical musicology sometimes involves translating theories from one knowledge domain to another. Adopting mathematical tools from statistical mechanics, they provide a compelling explanation for the historical emergence of complex musical tuning systems. **Milne** replicates and extends this work with two other entropy-based models that also follow the principle of minimizing dissonance while maximizing the compositional opportunity space. **McBride** pushes the boundaries of what an EMR commentary can entail by offering insightful, personal advice on how to bridge the communicative divide between physicists and music scientists.

**Di Stefano's** philosophically informed book review of Parncutt's *Psychoacoustic Foundations of Major-Minor Tonality* concludes this issue's far-reaching intellectual journey spanning from perceptual psychology to theory of science via information theory, neuroscience, cultural evolution, music theory, hearing science, and physics.

## REFERENCES

Clemente, A., Pearce, M. T., Skov, M., & Nadal, M. (2021). Evaluative judgment across domains: liking balance, contour, symmetry and complexity in melodies and visual designs. *Brain and Cognition*, 151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2021.105729>

