


2025

BJPS

ANNUAL REPORT



BRITISH JOURNAL FOR THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

The
**British
Journal**
for the
**Philosophy
of
Science**

EDITORIAL TEAM	01
BJPS POPPER PRIZE 2025	02
BJPS VOLUME 76	04
READERS	08
SUBMISSIONS	22
AUTHORS	28
ASSOCIATE EDITORS	35
MORE FROM THE BJPS	37

The
**British
Journal**
for the
**Philosophy
of
Science**

EDITORS

Co-Editors-in-Chief

Tim Lewens

Robert Rupert

Deputy Editor

Elizabeth Hannon

Associate Editors

Jon Bain

Pierrick Bourrat

Justin Bruner

Cameron Buckner

Igor Douven

Shane N Glackin

Nick Huggett

Mary Leng

Peter J Lewis

Greg Lusk

Caterina Marchionni

Kerry McKenzie

Lauren N Ross

Jonah N Schupbach


Daniel Steel

Emily Sullivan

Jackie Sullivan

Dana Tulodziecki

Alastair Wilson



THE BJPS POPPER PRIZE

FABRIZIO CALZAVARINI

‘The Conceptual Format Debate and the Challenge from (Global) Supramodality’

British Journal for the Philosophy of Science,
2025, **76**, pp. 45–74

The BJPS Popper Prize is awarded to the article judged to be the best published in that year’s volume of the Journal, as determined by the Editors-in-Chief, in consultation with the Journal’s Associate Editors and members of the BPS Committee.

HONORABLE MENTIONS

SHELDON GOLDSTEIN, WARD STRUYVE & RODERICH TUMULKA
‘The Bohmian Approach to the Problems of Cosmological
Quantum Fluctuations’

British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, 2025, 76, pp. 869–94

JOE ROUSSOS


‘Normative Formal Epistemology as Modelling’

British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, 2025, 76, pp. 421–48

CECILY WHITELEY

‘Depression as a Disorder of Consciousness’

British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, 2025, 76, pp. 663–90



THE BJPS POPPER PRIZE

In ‘The Conceptual Format Debate and the Challenge from (Global) Supramodality’, Fabrizio Calzavarini rejects one of cognitive neuroscience’s most entrenched commitments and argues that such rejection reshapes high-profile debates in philosophy of cognitive science and empirically oriented philosophy of mind. For well over a century, a fundamental distinction has lain at heart of neuroscientists’ understanding of functionally relevant architecture of the brain: the distinction between modally specific cortex, on the one hand, and amodal or non-modal cortex, on the other. In his prize-winning paper, Calzavarini reviews a robust range of neuroscientific data suggesting that extensive portions of what are traditionally considered modality-specific cortices are in fact ‘supramodal’; they process information independently of perceptual modality. On the most radical (though not necessarily implausible) interpretation of these data, so-called sensory cortices should be treated as task-specific contributors, not individuated by their role in processing distinctive channels of sensory input. This fascinating and potentially groundbreaking contribution to our understanding of neural architecture has striking implications regarding cognitive ontology. For instance, proponents of embodied perspectives on cognition often emphasize what they take to be the distinctively sensory grounding of human concepts and the effects of modality-specific grounding on cognitive processing. Yet, if Calzavarini’s view is correct, the entire debate over embodied concepts would seem to rest on a misconception of the kind of material available for conceptual grounding.

For its impressive contribution to debates of central importance in the philosophy of cognitive science, the BJPS Co-Editors-in-Chief and the BSPS Committee judge ‘The Conceptual Format Debate and the Challenge from (Global) Supramodality’ to be worthy of the 2025 BJPS Popper Prize.

*Tim Lewens & Robert Rupert
Co-Editors-in-Chief*

The
**British
Journal**
for the
**Philosophy
of
Science**

VOLUME 76
ISSUE 1

Why Confirm Laws?

BARRY WARD

On the Mathematics and Metaphysics of the Hole Argument

OLIVER POOLEY & JAMES READ

The Conceptual Format Debate

FABRIZIO CALZAVARINI

On Explaining the Success of Induction

TOM F. STERKENBURG

Putting Theory in Its Place:

The Relationship Between Universality Arguments and Empirical Constraints

GRACE E. FIELD

Mere Recurrence and Cumulative Culture at the Margins

ANDREW BUSKELL & CLAUDIO TENNIE

Hidden Costs of Epistemic Conformity:

Lessons from Information Cascade Simulations

PATRICIA RICH

Restricted Auditory Aspatialism

DOUGLAS C. WADLE

Does the No Alternatives Argument Need Gerrymandering?

RICHARD DAWID

Invention and Evolution of Correlated Conventions

DANIEL A. HERRMANN & BRIAN SKYRMS

Representation Without Informative Signalling

GERARDO VIERA

The
**British
Journal**
for the
**Philosophy
of
Science**

VOLUME 76
ISSUE 2

Evolutionary Transitions in Individuality by
Endogenization of Scaffolded Properties

PIERRICK BOURRAT

Closing the Hole Argument

HANS HALVORSON & JB MANCHAK

Jury Theorems for Peer Review

MARCUS ARVAN, LIAM KOFI BRIGHT & REMCO HEESEN

On the Objectivity of Measurement Outcomes

ELIAS OKON

Consensus Versus Unanimity: Which Carries More Weight?

FINNUR DELLSÉN

Abandoning Galileo's Ship:

The Quest for Non-relational Empirical Significance

SEBASTIÁN MURGUEITIO RAMÍREZ & NICHOLAS J TEH

Normative Formal Epistemology as Modelling

JOE ROUSSOS

How to Distinguish Between Indistinguishable Particles

MICHAEL TE VRUGT

Best Laid Plans: Idealization and the Rationality–Accuracy Bridge

BRETT TOPEY

What Are the 'Levels' in Levels of Selection?

MARKUS ERONEN & GRANT RAMSEY

The
**British
Journal**
for the
**Philosophy
of
Science**

VOLUME 76
ISSUE 3

The Interdisciplinary Entanglement of Characterization and Explanation
MAX DRESOW & ALAN C LOVE

The One Magic Wave: Quantum Monism Meets Wavefunction Realism
CLAUDIO CALOSI

The Comparison of Inequality Measurements Across Countries and Time
ALESSANDRA BASSO

A Complementary Account of Scientific Modelling: Modelling Mechanisms
in Cancer Immunology
MARTIN ZACH

Time Reversal Invariance and Ontology
WARD STRUYVE

The Literalist Fallacy and the Free Energy Principle: Model Building,
Scientific Realism, and Instrumentalism
MICHAEL KIRCHHOFF, JULIAN KIVERSTEIN & IAN ROBERTSON

Depression as a Disorder of Consciousness
CECILY WHITELEY

Host Specificity in Biological Control
THOMAS BLANCHARD

Knowledge of the Quantum Domain: An Overlap Strategy
JAMES D FRASER & PETER VICKERS

Sifting the Signal from the Noise
DANIEL A HERRMANN & JACOB VANDRUNEN

Inference to the Best Contradiction?
SAM BARON

Statistical Autonomous Explanations and the Patterns of Nature:
A Modified Account
TRAVIS HOLMES & ANDRÉ I ARIEW

The
**British
Journal**
for the
**Philosophy
of
Science**

VOLUME 76
ISSUE 4

Semanticization Challenges the Episodic–Semantic Distinction

SARA ARONOWITZ

Why the Weyl Tile Argument Is Wrong

LU CHEN

Biochemical Functions

FRANCESCA BELLAZZI

The Bohmian Approach to the Problems of Cosmological Quantum Fluctuations

SHELDON GOLDSTEIN, WARD STRUYVE & RODERICH TUMULKA

A Hybrid Theory of Induction

ADRIÀ SEGARRA

Bayesian Merging of Opinions and Algorithmic Randomness

FRANCESCA ZAFFORA BLANDO

Against Prohibition (or, When Using Ordinal Scales to Compare Groups Is OK)

CRISTIAN LARROULET PHILIPPI

Are We in a Sixth Mass Extinction?

The Challenges of Answering and Value of Asking

FEDERICA BOCCHI, ALISA BOKULICH, LETICIA CASTILLO BRACHE,
GLORIA GRAND-PIERRE & AJA WATKINS

A Falsificationist Account of Artificial Neural Networks

OLIVER BUCHHOLZ & ERIC RAIDL

General-Purpose Institutional Decision-Making Heuristics:

The Case of Decision-Making Under Deep Uncertainty

DAVID THORSTAD

The Typical Principle

ISAAC WILHELM

READERS



READERS



NOTE ON JOURNAL METRICS

Most rankings have a ‘philosophy’ category and a ‘history and philosophy of science’ category. The following lists are amalgamations of both. All relevant philosophy of science titles are included. Similarly ranked generalist journals from the philosophy category and which have with some overlap with the BJPS are also included.

Both of these categories also include many journals that are not useful for comparison, since there is negligible overlap between their content or readers and ours. These journals have been excluded.

Each ranking is based on a slightly different methodology.

JOURNAL IMPACT FACTOR

Method: Citations received in 2025 to papers published 2023–24, divided by the number of papers published 2023–24.

SCIMAGO

Method: SCImago counts citations over the previous three years, but then weights them. Citations from ‘high prestige’ journals are weighed more heavily than ‘low prestige’ journals.

The h-index is the largest h such that h articles have at least h citations. In the case of the BJPS, in 2025, 75 papers had at least 75 citations.

GOOGLE SCHOLAR

Method: The h5-index is the largest h such that h papers, published over the previous five years (2020–24), have at least h citations. The h-median is the median number of citations for papers published over the same period.

CITESCORE


Method: CiteScore is calculated by dividing the number of citations from the previous four years (2022–25) by the number of papers published in the same period.

JOURNAL IMPACT FACTOR



JOURNAL	JIF 2025	JIF 2024
British Journal for the Philosophy of Science	3.1	2.3
Philosophy of Science	1.7	1.1
Philosophy and Phenomenological Research	1.6	1.4
European Journal for Philosophy of Science	1.5	1.8
Synthese	1.5	1.3
Biology & Philosophy	1.3	1.8
Studies in the History & Philosophy of Science	1.3	1.8
Foundations of Science	1.2	0.9
History & Philosophy of the Life Sciences	1	1
Journal for General Philosophy of Science	0.9	0.9

TRENDS




SCIMAGO JOURNAL RANKINGS



JOURNAL	SJR 2025	H-INDEX 2025	SJR (H-INDEX) 2024
Noûs	2.563	93	2.795 (88)
Mind	1.930	77	1.978 (71)
British Journal for the Philosophy of Science	1.901	75	1.923 (70)
Philosophy and Phenomenological Research	1.602	66	1.573 (66)
European Journal for Philosophy of Science	1.074	36	0.971 (32)
Philosophy of Science	1.035	95	0.695 (89)
Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science	0.950	60	1.012 (60)
Synthese	0.877	95	1.052 (89)
Biology and Philosophy	0.679	67	0.815 (62)
Journal for General Philosophy of Science	0.654	22	0.654 (22)

TRENDS




GOOGLE SCHOLAR



JOURNAL	H5-INDEX 2025	H5-MEDIAN 2025	H5-INDEX (H-MEDIAN) 2024
Synthese	59	78	54 (78)
British Journal for the Philosophy of Science	32	55	34 (63)
Noûs	32	53	34 (63)
European Journal for Philosophy of Science	28	38	24 (33)
Studies in History and Philosophy of Science	28	37	22 (36)
Philosophy of Science	27	40	27 (38)
Erkenntnis	24	35	24 (35)
History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences	23	32	20 (26)
Journal for General Philosophy of Science	18	27	16 (24)

TRENDS




CITESCORE



JOURNAL	2025	2024
Noûs	5.4	5.6
British Journal for the Philosophy of Science	5.1	6.3
Studies in History and Philosophy of Science	3.8	3.2
Biology and Philosophy	3.5	4.0
European Journal for Philosophy of Science	3.2	3.6
Philosophy and Phenomenological Research	3.0	3.3
Philosophy of Science	2.6	1.8
Synthese	2.4	4.1
Foundations of Physics	2.3	2.5
History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences	2.1	3.2

TRENDS



ALTMETRICS



Engagement as measured by Altmetrics

NOTE Altmetric scores track attention in non-traditional media (newspapers, policy reports, social media, blog posts)

JOURNAL	PAPERS	MENTIONS	SCORE
British Journal for the Philosophy of Science	1074	9459	8.81
Biology & Philosophy	799	6547	8.19
Mind	1139	7884	6.92
Synthese	3584	23536	6.57
Philosophy Compass	771	4557	5.91
European Journal for Philosophy of Science	452	2648	5.86
Ergo	526	2891	5.50
Nous	533	2469	4.63
Philosophy of Science	1198	5017	4.19
Journal for General Philosophy of Science	311	1274	4.10

WHAT'S BEING READ



Most viewed papers in 2025 published in 2025

- 1 ARVAN, M, KOFI BRIGHT, L & HEESEN, R
Jury Theorems for Peer Review
- 2 ARONOWITZ, S
Consensus Versus Unanimity: Which Carries More Weight?
- 3 BOURRAT, P
Evolutionary Transitions in Individuality by Endogenization of Scaffolded Properties
- 4 BARON, S
Inference to the Best Contradiction?
- 5 CALZAVARINI, F
The Conceptual Format Debate and the Challenge from (Global) Supramodality
- 6 ROUSSOS, J
Normative Formal Epistemology as Modelling
- 7 LOVE, A C & DRESOW, M
The Interdisciplinary Entanglement of Characterization and Explanation
- 8 BELLAZZI, F
Biochemical Functions
- 9 ARONOWITZ, S
Semanticization Challenges the Episodic–Semantic Distinction
- 10 READ, J & POOLEY, O
On the Mathematics and Metaphysics of the Hole Argument

WHAT'S BEING READ



Most viewed papers in 2025 published anytime

- 1 KOFI BRIGHT, L & HEESEN, R
Is Peer Review a Good Idea? (2021)
- 2 LEMOINE, M, KHELFAOUI, M, PRADEU, T & GINGRAS, Y
Philosophy in Science: Can Philosophers of Science Permeate through Science and Produce Scientific Knowledge? (2024)
- 3 WERNDL, C
On Defining Climate and Climate Change (2009)
- 4 ROSS, L N
Causal Concepts in Biology: How Pathways Differ from Mechanisms and Why It Matters (2021)
- 5 POWELL, R & CLARKE, S
Religion as an Evolutionary Byproduct: A Critique of the Standard Model (2012)
- 6 MEIER, L J
The Demise of Brain Death (2022)
- 7 MÜLLER, T & PLACEK, T
Defining Determinism (2018)
- 8 FRANKLIN, A & SEIFERT, V A
The Problem of Molecular Structure Just Is the Measurement Problem (2024)
- 9 ARVAN, M, KOFI BRIGHT, L & HEESEN, R
Jury Theorems for Peer Review (2025)
- 10 CARRUTHERS, P
The Contents and Causes of Curiosity (2024)

WHAT'S BEING CITED



Most cited BJPS papers published in 2025

- 1 KIRCHHOFF, M D, KIVERSTEIN, J & ROBERTSON, I
The Literalist Fallacy and the Free Energy Principle: Model Building, Scientific Realism, and Instrumentalism
- 2 ARONOWITZ, S
Semanticization Challenges the Episodic-Semantic Distinction
- 3 BOURRAT, P
Evolutionary Transitions in Individuality by Endogenization of Scaffolded Properties
- 4 ARVAN, M, KOFI BRIGHT, L & HEESEN, R
Jury Theorems for Peer Review
- 5 BUSKELL, A & TENNIE, C
Mere Recurrence and Cumulative Culture at the Margins
- 6 HEESEN, R & KOFI BRIGHT, L
Is Peer Review a Good Idea?
- 7 WHITELEY, C
Depression as a Disorder of Consciousness
- 8 BOCCHI, F, BOKULICH, A, ET AL.
Are We in a Sixth Mass Extinction? The Challenges of Answering and Value of Asking
- 9 CALOSI, C
The One Magic Wave: Quantum Monism Meets Wavefunction Realism
- 10 DELLSÉN, F
Consensus Versus Unanimity: Which Carries More Weight?

WHAT'S BEING CITED



Most cited BJPS papers published 2016–2025

- 1 SULLIVAN, E
Understanding from Machine Learning Models (2022)
- 2 CRAVER, C F & KAPLAN, D M
Are More Details Better? On the Norms of Completeness for Mechanistic Explanations (2020)
- 3 RITCHIE, J B, KAPLAN, D M & KLEIN, C
Decoding the Brain: Neural Representation and the Limits of Multivariate Pattern Analysis in Cognitive Neuroscience (2019)
- 4 BAUMGARTNER, M & GEBHARTER, A
Constitutive Relevance, Mutual Manipulability, and Fat-Handedness (2016)
- 5 REUTLINGER, A, HANGLEITER, D & HARTMANN, S
Understanding with (Toy) Models (2018)
- 6 HEESEN, R & KOFI BRIGHT, L
Is Peer Review a Good Idea? (2021)
- 7 SCHROEDER, S A
Democratic Values: A Better Foundation for Public Trust in Science (2021)
- 8 DASGUPTA, S
Symmetry as an Epistemic Notion (Twice Over) (2016)
- 9 ALEXANDROVA, A
Can the Science of Well-Being Be Objective? (2018)
- 10 SCHUPBACH, J N
Robustness Analysis as Explanatory Reasoning (2018)

WHAT'S BEING CITED




Most cited BJPS papers published anytime

- 1 HALPERN, J Y & PEARL, J
Causes and Explanations: A Structural-Model Approach, Part I: Causes (2005)
- 2 FORSTER, M & SOBER, E
How to Tell When Simpler, More Unified, or Less ad hoc Theories Will Provide More Accurate Predictions (1994)
- 3 POPPER, K R
The Propensity Interpretation of Probability (1959)
- 4 HULL, D L
The Effect of Essentialism on Taxonomy: 2000 Years of Stasis (1965)
- 5 GRIMM, S R
Is Understanding a Species of Knowledge? (2006)
- 6 WEISBERG, M
Who Is a Modeller? (2007)
- 7 EARMAN, J & NORTON, J D
What Price Spacetime Substantivalism: The Hole Story (1987)
- 8 MOSSIO, M, SABORIDO, C & MORENO, A
An Organizational Account of Biological Functions (2009)
- 9 HAUSMAN, D M & WOODWARD, J
Independence, Invariance, and the Causal Markov Condition (1999)
- 10 GRIFFITHS, P E
Functional-Analysis and Proper Functions (1993)


WHAT'S BEING CITED



Citations to BJPS articles



Citations in BJPS articles



SUBMISSIONS



HIGHLIGHTS



701

Total number of papers submitted, up from 607 in 2024 (up 15.5%)

564 original submissions (486 in 2024)

117 resubmissions (121 in 2024)

8.6

Of the 588 final decisions made in 2024, 8.6% were to accept the paper, down from 10% in 2024

31

Percentage decrease in pages accepted for publication compared to 2024.

As part of a broad strategy to reduce publication backlog, a strict page limit on submissions was implemented. Shorter papers mean more papers can be published per volume, reducing the time between a paper appearing online and in print.


39

Average number of days to decision, down from 42 days in 2024


SUBMISSIONS



Number of submissions per year




Resubmissions as % of overall submissions




DECISIONS



Acceptance rate (papers accepted versus papers rejected in 2025)



Original submissions: Rejection types



NOTES

Desk rejects: Rejection decided wholly by Co-Editors-in-Chief


Rejection with vetting: Rejection after Associate Editor input

Rejection with reviews: Rejection after referee input


DECISIONS



Original submissions




Re-submissions



NOTES

Numbers reflect papers submitted in 2025 with a final decision (some papers remain in progress)

THE LIFECYCLE OF A BJPS PAPER




*Exceptions made for holiday periods, illness, and so on.


SPEED



Days to first decision



Average days to decision per year



NOTES

The lifespan of an accepted paper in 2025 was **213** days. This includes 12 week / 6 week periods where the paper is with the author(s) for major / minor revisions.



REFEREES

1308

Invitations issued

825

Individuals invited to referee

557

Invitations accepted

387

Individuals agreed to referee

6


Average number of referee invitations per paper

33

Average number of days for referees to return a report

60

Average number of days from first referee invitation to receipt of both referee reports



For her many careful, constructive reports,

AJA WATKINS

was chosen by the BJPS Editors as the Referee of 2025

Honorable Mentions

MATTEO COLOMBO

DUSTIN LAZAROVICI


AUTHORS




CO-AUTHORSHIP



Percentage of papers with two or more authors



Number of co-authors (papers submitted in 2025)




NOTES

AI-generated papers tend to be single-authored, so may be depressing growth in co-authorship
 Numbers of accepted papers small, so more prone to noise
 Co-authored papers are more likely than single-authored papers to be published
 Note first appearance of divergence in trends between submissions and accepted papers


SEX



Submitted papers (%)



Published papers (%)



NOTES

Sex as reported by author


Number of published papers (44) is small so prone to noise

Submitted papers and published papers are two non-overlapping sets


GEOGRAPHY




Submitted papers (%)
Country of corresponding author



Accepted papers (%)
Country of corresponding author



BJPS



Short Reads
Review of Books
Letters to the Editors

The
**British
Journal**
for the
**Philosophy
of
Science**



New books in the philosophy of science

GUIDO BACCIAGALUPPI
& ELISE CRULL

The Einstein Paradox

Reviewed by
Thomas Ryckman

ARMIN SCHULZ

It's Only Human

Reviewed by
Olivier Morin

CHRIS HAUFE

Fruitfulness

Reviewed by
Samuel Schindler
& *Patrick Duerr*

KIAN SALIMKHANI

**The Non-
fundamentality
of Spacetime**

Reviewed by
Noel Swanson

WILLIAM BAUSMAN,
JANELLA BAXTER
& OLIVER LEAN

**From Biological
Practice to Scientific
Metaphysics**

Reviewed by
Jay Odenbaugh

SHANNON VALLOR

The AI Mirror

Reviewed by
Robert Hudson

NICHOLAS SHEA

**Concepts at
the Interface**

Reviewed by
Peter Carruthers

DANIEL KENNEFICK

**No Shadow
of a Doubt**

Reviewed by
Mauricio Suárez

KATHRYN NAVE

**A Drive to
Survive**

Reviewed by
Matteo Colombo

ROBERTA MILLSTEIN

**The Land Is Our
Community**

Reviewed by
Julia Pelletier,
Aja Watkins
& *Andrew Zeppa*

KATHERINE BRADING
& MARIUS STAN

**Philosophical
Mechanics
in the Age
of Reason**

Reviewed by
Mark Wilson

MAGNUS ENQUIST,
STEFANO GHIRLANDA
& JOHAN LIND

**The Human
Evolutionary
Transition**

Reviewed by
Ronald Planer
& *Claudio Tennie*

H K ANDERSEN
& SANDRA MITCHELL

**The Pragmatist
Challenge**

Reviewed by
Matthew J Brown

YAFENG SHAN

**Alternative
Approaches
to Causation**

Reviewed by
Vera Hoffmann-Kolss

JAMES READ

**Background
Independence
in Classical and
Quantum Gravity**

Reviewed by
Sebastian De Haro



Also available in audio



YouTube



Spotify



Listen on
Apple Podcasts

STEPHEN JOHN

SCIENTISTS ON TAP, NOT ON TOP

Why scientists cannot, and should not, care about policymakers' values

EMILY ADLAM

QUESTIONING SELF-LOCATION

Is there an objectively correct way to form beliefs about when or where you are?

REUBEN STERN

CORRELATION, CAUSATION, AND CHOICE

When are interventions evidence for their non-effects?

SUSANA MONSÓ & LAURA DANÓN

DEATH IN MIND

What does the opossum's playing dead tell us about animal minds?

NAFTALI WEINBERGER, PORTER WILLIAMS & JAMES WOODWARD

WHY DOES CAUSAL REASONING WORK?

On the role of worldly infrastructure

British Journal for the Philosophy of Science

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

The editors invite letters that make a short, sharp point worth having on record but not requiring a full-length paper.

Letters must be in direct response to a BJPS article published no more than five years before, and must meet the highest standards of collegiality.

They may concern factual errors, overlooked literature, objections, counterexamples, or any other matter of philosophical interest.

Authors of target articles will be given the opportunity to respond, after which no further exchanges will be published.

Among other things, we hope this will allow productive dialogue to emerge between philosophers of science and scientists, without requiring scientists to write articles suitable for the BJPS

SOCIAL MEDIA⁺



FACEBOOK

10k

Followers

36.4 %

Of social media referrals



LINKEDIN

300

Followers

8 %

Of social media referrals




BLUESKY

5.8k

Followers

45.4 %

Of social media referrals



CHATGPT

59 %

Of AI referrals to website

PERPLEXITY

18.6 %

Of AI referrals to website

GEMINI

14.7 %

Of AI referrals to website

CLAUDE

7.6 %

Of AI referrals to website

NOTE

The BJPS Twitter account was deactivated in 2025. We are in the process of building a LinkedIn account to ensure BJPS papers retain their impact.

Twitter was responsible for 10% of traffic from social media across 2025, which is comparable to LinkedIn, though note the LinkedIn account was only operational over a much shorter period.

 bjps@thebsps.org

 Auxiliary Hypotheses: The BJPS Blog

 @TheBJPS

 @thebjps.bsky.social

 @bjpscience

 @BJPSscience

