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INTRODUCTION

Barrett et al. (2014) argue that the primary contribution of evolutionary psychology (EP), as defined by the Santa Barbara school (Cosmides and Tooby, 1987; see also Laland and Brown, 2011) is the conception of the mind as a collection of separate, domain-specific mental modules that evolved to solve specific adaptive problems. This, they argue, means that EP does not represent a true alternative to computational models of mind and is therefore not a significant advance on more traditional cognitive approaches. Instead, they recommend that e-cognition, and in particular the concept of the extended mind, can best enhance our understanding of human mind and behavior. While we appreciate Barrett et al.’s enthusiasm for an interesting and relatively new approach to understanding mind and behavior, we argue here that, independent of the veracity of the concept of massive modularity (which is an empirical question; Barrett et al., 2014; Burke, 2014; Stephen, 2014), an evolutionary approach provides a substantial advance in the understanding of mind and behavior. Here, we make two main arguments. First, we argue that a full understanding of mind, brain and behavior requires the consideration of all four of Tinbergen’s levels of explanation, which can only be achieved by approaching the problem through the lens of evolution (independent of the assumption of massive, domain-specific modularity, or of any other model). Second, we argue that the embodied cognition approach advocated by Barrett et al. (2014) is actually better understood as an extension of traditional causal (mechanistic), and ontogenetic (developmental) approaches than as a revolutionary approach in its own right, and therefore is best examined through the lens of evolution.

THE VALUE OF EVOLUTIONARY APPROACHES TO MIND AND BEHAVIOR

In what is now widely considered the foundational document of human ethology, Niko Tinbergen makes the case that behavior can be addressed at four different explanatory levels (Tinbergen, 1963). In addition to the causal (or mechanistic) and ontogenetic (developmental) levels of explanation that are typical of modern psychology, Tinbergen proposed that a full understanding of behavior requires that we consider two additional, evolutionary levels of explanation. The phylogenetic level considers the evolutionary history of the behavior, and the functional level considers what he calls the survival value, or what modern evolutionists would call the fitness value or selective value of the behavior (though more recently, O’Brien and Gallup, 2011, have suggested that the role of culture represents a fifth level of explanation). While Barrett et al. (2014) assert that the primary advance offered by EP is the conception of the mind as massively modular, we suggest that the defining feature of evolutionary approaches to psychology is simply the application of the evolutionary concepts of selection and fitness to human behavior. This approach allows us to address human psychology through Tinbergen’s phylogenetic and functional levels of explanation, providing novel hypotheses and a more thorough understanding of the subject. Despite rarely being acknowledged directly, these principles are applied in a range of evolutionary approaches to mind and behavior (e.g., Stephen, 2013).

This application of evolutionary concepts to psychology is not reliant on the assumption of massive, domain-specific modularity, since predictions derived from such an assumption are often identical to those derived from evolutionary approaches based on plasticity, domain-generality, and cultural evolution. What changes is merely the level on which selection is assumed to act. Whereas a Santa-Barbara school Evolutionary Psychologist would think of selection as acting upon genes coding for domain-specific, yet flexible, mental modules, a more domain-general evolutionary approach would see selection as acting upon the behaviors themselves. In either case, the behaviors and cognitions selected for and against remain the same (Burke, 2014; Stephen, 2014). Indeed, the majority of research in this area does not make direct assumptions about massive modularity or lack thereof (Burke, 2014; Stephen, 2014). The question of whether the mind is massively modular and domain-specific or plastic and culturally selected remains, then, an important empirical question (Barrett et al., 2014), but one that is tangential to the issue of whether evolution offers a useful contribution to the study of mind and behavior (Stephen, 2014).

Irrespective, then, of the unit of selection, we suggest that an evolutionary approach can offer unique insights into understanding and predicting behavior. Indeed, most of the added value brought by an evolutionary approach is reflected...
in the two neglected aspects (for psychology at least) of Tinbergen’s ethological approach to behavior. Evolutionary psychologists are perhaps with good reason shy of admitting that consideration of function may be useful when thinking about behavior. Much of this concern relates to a posteriori reasoning, and the criticism of “just so stories.” However, a consideration of function a priori can be a powerful aid to theorizing and hypothesis generation. In research on disgust, for example, the principal driver behind studying this emotion’s relationship with the immune system was based upon the idea that disgust functions to aid disease avoidance (Stevenson et al., 2011). Without a consideration of the functional value of this emotion, such avenues of enquiry would not have been envisaged.

A further benefit of an evolutionary approach is in consideration of the phylogenetic origin of a particular behavior. This seems to be a more neglected line of reasoning within human EP, but it can be highly instructive. Again, take disgust as an illustrative example. It has been argued that disgust is a uniquely human emotion, with a small phylogenetic “tail” (Rozin et al., 2010). This “tail” extends into other mammals (and beyond) and has been termed “distaste.” Distaste functions primarily as a specific defense against consuming bitter (poisonous) food. However, mammals and indeed all animals face similar pathogen threats to humans, and it would be surprising if we did not also share some of the same basic behaviors to avoid getting sick. In fact, a very extensive set of disease avoidant behaviors have been documented in animals (e.g., Hart, 2011) but surprisingly, almost no research has explored whether the emotion of disgust plays a role in animal disease avoidance. Not only, then, can the idea of phylogenetic continuity act to stimulate new avenues for research, it can also act to complement the functional approach. For example, if animals do use disgust to assist disease avoidance, this would be consistent with the functional interpretation of disgust in humans. Further, Schaller and Murray’s (2008) finding of regional personality differences corresponding to pathogen prevalence offers a clear illustration of the use of evolutionary theorizing to generate novel predictions across multiple levels to draw a connection between traditionally disparate domains. Crucially, none of this theorizing relies upon a commitment to any particular theory of the unit of selection.

Intra-species color cues may be taken as another example of a phylogenetic approach that has advanced our understanding of human behavior. Color is frequently used to convey information in non-human animals. For example, male hooded vultures have highly vascularized, exposed skin on their heads, which flush red during antagonistic encounters, and male ostriches show redder necks during the mating season, suggesting that this hemoglobin-based coloration is a cue to dominance and fertility (Negro et al., 2006). A phylogenetic approach allows us to make predictions about the kinds of perceptual biases and behaviors that we expect to see in humans and other species. We know that the majority of mammals have only dichromatic vision that precludes the differentiation of red from green (Carroll et al., 2001), whereas old world, and some new world, primates have trichromatic vision. The phylogenetic approach thus allows us to predict that we may see red cues in primates, including humans and old world monkeys, but not in non-primate mammals, and new world monkeys with dichromatic vision (Changizi et al., 2006). This is indeed what we see. The red coloration of mandrills’ faces increases with higher position in the dominance hierarchy and with higher testosterone (Setchell and Dixson, 2001). During antagonistic confrontations, the less red male is more likely to back down (Setchell and Wickings, 2005), and female mandrills prefer to mate with redder faced males, irrespective of alpha status (Setchell, 2005). Similarly, in humans, we see redder facial skin in men interpreted as appearing more aggressive, dominant, attractive (Stephen et al., 2012), and healthy (Stephen et al., 2009a,b). Indeed, it has been suggested that one evolved function of trichromatic vision in primates may be to enable individuals to identify color-based social cues (Changizi et al., 2006).

This prediction of human psychological traits based on phylogenetic approaches, then, allows enhanced predictive power and greater understanding of the psychology of humans.

e-COGNITION’S PROXIMAL EXPLANATORY NATURE

Barrett et al. (2014) suggest that an alternative to the standard computational theories of mind (in which they include the Santa Barbara school EP) is the various e-cognition approaches. They focus on one form, the extended mind hypothesis (e.g., Clark and Chalmers, 1998), which holds that the boundaries of cognition extend well beyond the central nervous system, so that the body and the environment form a coupled system that governs behavior. The main benefit of such an approach, according to Barrett et al. (2014), is that it encompasses the complex array of external features (e.g., written language, visual aids, etc.) that shape human behavior in the current environment.

While we agree that e-cognition approaches offer potentially interesting ways of understanding behavior, we would also argue that they are essentially elaborations of the computational models of mind that Barrett et al. (2014) criticize, representing extensions of Tinbergen’s (1963) causal (mechanistic), and ontogenetic (developmental) levels of explanation. Extending the boundary of cognition to include objects that are not typically considered as part of the cognitive system (e.g., a shopping-list memory aid) does not address a functional or phylogenetic level of analysis, any more than does a standard computational approach. This can only be achieved by studying behavior through the evolutionary concepts of selection and fitness. As such, Barrett et al.’s suggested alternative to EP—e-cognition—does not represent a true alternative to computational models of mind, but rather an extension of these approaches that should be best approached through the lens of evolutionary theory. In this way, Barrett et al.’s (2014) conception of e-cognition as an alternative to evolutionary approaches to cognition and behavior mischaracterizes e-cognition as an ultimate explanatory framework, when it should properly be considered proximal (see Scott-Phillips et al., 2011, for similar arguments in response to previously proposed alternative ultimate explanatory frameworks, such as cultural evolution and epigenetics).
Accordingly, we argue that evolutionary approaches provide significant additional predictive and explanatory value above standard computational models by allowing researchers to address the phylogenetic and functional levels of explanation. Evolutionary approaches to mind and behavior, then, go well beyond existing approaches in their potential to provide an understanding, not necessarily of the how, but of the why, humans behave as they do in an unpredictable world. Consider, for example, the richness and complexity of human emotion: forged over the course of human evolution and responding to present day triggers, the passions drive behavior—albeit often to dysfunctional ends within modern societies (e.g., Fitness and Case, 2003). Understanding such diverse emotions as anger, jealousy, hate, love, disgust, or shame as evolution’s executioners (Wright, 1995) provides us with an answer to the question of the “why” of behavior that cannot be addressed by only causal and ontogenetic levels of analysis. In short, e-cognition accounts, along with other approaches that do not hold the evolutionary principles of selection and fitness as central represent only extensions of the more proximate explanations of mind and behavior, rather than providing the fuller understanding of cognition and behavior that ensues from phylogenetic and functional levels of explanation. Further, one extraordinary achievement of evolutionary approaches to mind and behavior has been to demonstrate the commonalities shared by human beings across time and space as a function of the adaptive problems they have always faced, and continue to face, as social animals who depend upon one another for their survival. Certainly, humans today are confronted with a material, technological world that could not be imagined by humans who lived thousands of years ago. However, a baby from our recent evolutionary past miraculously transported through time to a modern Western environment would still crave attachment and belonging, experience, and respond to the world and others through her senses and feelings, and learn through language how to interpret, communicate, and function more or less adaptively in that environment, just as babies raised in regions geographically distant from their ancestral homelands do today. No doubt she would also help her parents program their latest iPhone along the way.
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Review Guidelines

Frontiers Reviews significantly redefine the assignments for both authors and editors in order to guarantee the most accurate, efficient and impartial reviews in academic publishing. Frontiers reviews largely rely on the advanced IT functionalities of the Frontiers platform and are typically articulated into two consecutive phases:

INDEPENDENT REVIEW

During the Independent Review phase, the review editors assess the paper independently from each other and the authors, according to a standardized review template.

INTERACTIVE REVIEW

During the Interactive Review phase, authors and Review Editors can interact with each other through real-time comments in the discussion forum. The Associate Editor and if required the Specialty Chief Editor can also enter the Review Forum and oversee this review process.

Frontiers Review at a Glance

The Frontiers Review System provides and guarantees:

OPEN REVIEWS

Frontiers is striving to remove any bias from the review process and acknowledge the reviewers for the significant contributions in improving the paper. To guarantee the most transparent and objective reviews, the identities of review editors remain anonymous during the review period. Only in case an article is accepted do their names appear on the published manuscript, without exceptions. However, if for any reasons a review editor withdraws during any stage of the review process, his/her name will not be disclosed.

STANDARDIZED AND HIGH QUALITY REVIEWS

Frontiers provides a review template to make reviews systematic and convene the efforts of review editors exclusively on objective issues. The review must focus solely on the quality of both the research and the manuscript, and aim at providing constructive comments to bring the final paper to its best quality. This allows fair, rapid, comprehensive and comparable assessment of research. The evaluation of the research will be done successively by means of the Frontiers Evaluation System. Moreover, Frontiers provides authors with the highest quality review service by assigning only the world’s top researchers to the Frontiers Boards of editors.

INTERACTIVE REVIEWS

Our Interactive Review Forum facilitates the review process by enabling all participants (authors, review editors, the associate editor and, if needed, the specialty chief editor) to view reports and directly communicate with one another to easily address comments regarding an article. Indeed, the goal of the Interactive Review is to facilitate convergence of opinions. This phase allows unlimited rounds of reviews and resubmissions, until the manuscript is deemed acceptable.

RAPID PAPER PENDING PUBLICATIONS

Once the Interactive Review Forum is activated, Frontiers allows to immediately publish the abstract of an article in review as “paper pending”. By securing the public declaration date of the discovery, the paper pending allows a pressure-free and most effective collaboration with the review editors towards improving the manuscript, without the concern that the authors’ discovery might be scooped while the review is on-going.

OBJECTIVE REVIEW

Frontiers promotes a strict separation between review and evaluation. Review editors may comment only in regard to objective issues and may reject research papers based exclusively upon objective errors. The mandate for review editors is to ensure that the results are valid, the analysis is flawless and the quality as high as possible. The significance of articles is separately evaluated by the entire community by means of the Frontiers Evaluation System.

ARBITRATIONS

Should a dispute arise that threatens to reject an article, the author may trigger arbitration. In the first place, the associate editor will arbitrate and involve all review editors in a discussion aimed at resolving the dispute. If a resolution cannot be agreed upon, the specialty chief editor is alerted and can opt to bring in additional review and associate editors for consultation. An article can be rejected if the arbitration rules that the objective error stands. Review editors are entitled to trigger arbitration, too, if they reckon that the author is reluctant to make required changes. Review editors may withdraw from the review process if they disagree with other editors, the authors and the arbitration rulings (in which case their identity remains undisclosed). The withdrawal of a review editor requires the recruitment of a new one, and significantly slows down the process. Therefore, authors are encouraged to co-operate as much as possible in addressing the concerns of the review editors involved with their articles.

Full Peer Review

The following articles types are attributed a full, standardized peer review:

Tier 1: Original Research Articles, Hypothesis & Theory Articles, Perspective Articles, Methods Articles, Clinical Case Studies, Mini Reviews and Review Articles.

Tier 2: Focused Reviews
POST SUBMISSION STEPS

Following the Frontiers online manuscript submission, an associate editor of the relevant Frontiers Specialty is immediately invited to take on the manuscript editorial assignment. After a preliminary content check, the associate editor may either decide to send the manuscript out for review or recommend it for immediate rejection to the specialty chief editor.

In the latter case, the specialty chief editor may confirm the associate editor’s recommendation of immediate article rejection due to the following reasons:

- An objective error (generally accepted by the community and not one that would be debatable by some);
- An excessive amount of language errors;
- Lack of research quality or ethical standards.

The specialty chief editor may, nevertheless, override the associate editor's recommendation and decide that the manuscript deserves being reviewed, in which case he/she will assign the article to a new associate editor who agrees to send the article for review.

The associate editor then assigns the article to at least two review editors, either selected from the Frontiers Board of review editors or appropriately recruited among the experts in the area. The whole process described above is a rapid one, since review editors are invited within one week from article submission and must accept or decline a review invitation within a few business days.

INDEPENDENT REVIEW PHASE

Within ten days after being assigned to an article, the review editors shall submit the standardized Frontiers Independent Review Report via the online review forum. The associate editor is automatically notified as soon as each of the Independent Review Reports is submitted.

During the Independent Review phase, the review editors assess the paper independently from each other and the authors, according to our standardized review template.

Once all review editors have submitted an Independent Review Report, the associate editor is responsible for activating the successive phase of the Frontiers Review, i.e. the Interactive Review Forum. Even if the Independent Review Reports are unfavorable to the authors, the Interactive Review Forum must be activated to allow authors the opportunity of rebuttal.

INTERACTIVE REVIEW PHASE

Once the associate editor activates the Interactive Review Forum, authors are immediately notified to enter the forum, where they are able to view the review comments, and have up to two months to prepare responses and/or a revised manuscript resubmission, if necessary.

The associate editor monitors the discussions occurring between authors and review editors within this forum, and ensures not only the timeliness, but also the constructiveness of the participants’ interaction. Should a dispute arise at this stage, the associate editor must act as a mediator, working with all parties involved to resolve the issues and even inviting new review editors for further opinions. If the disagreement persists, the specialty chief editor is then obliged to enter the Interactive Review Forum, examine the situation and take a final decision, as to whether the review should be ended by article rejection or continued by a new set of editors.

When a disagreement cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of a review editor, the latter is in full right to withdraw from the review at any phase, in which case the associate editor will invite another review editor.

At this stage, a manuscript may be rejected for the following reasons:

- an objective error is found that cannot be corrected;
- experiments are found to be invalid;
- authors are unable or unwilling to address issues raised by the review editors.

The review is complete once all review comments are addressed to the review editors' satisfaction.

ARTICLE ACCEPTANCE

If the review editors are satisfied with the authors’efforts at amending the manuscript, they then briefly finalize their Interactive Review Reports, which automatically notifies the associate editor of article acceptance. The associate editor accepts the final version of the manuscript within five days, and this action does not require the approval of the specialty chief editor.

Once a manuscript is accepted, the authors receive an automated notification informing them of the acceptance and the provisional PDF will instantly appear online. Review editors are invited to publish a one-page joint commentary to be linked to the published article, however this is not mandatory. Payment of the publication fee is required within thirty days of acceptance and necessary before final publication of the manuscript.

REJECTION

Articles can only be rejected by the chief editor, while the associate editor who handles an article can only recommend to reject an article. The chief editor may override an associate editor’s recommendation to reject the article and insist to call in further review editors to continue the review process.

TIER 2

If the submitted article is a Focused Review, i.e. a prestigious, invitation-only, tier 2 review highlighting an outstanding tier 1 article, the previous Associate and Review Editors are assigned the review of the new manuscript again (if available to take on the article). This manuscript is again written by the previous authors and is an abridged and revised version of the original article following the author guidelines for Focused Reviews. It requires a full peer review in regard to technical language, since it addresses a broader, less specialized community.

Short Peer Review

The following articles types are attributed a shortened peer review:

- Tier 1: Commentaries, Opinion Articles, Editorials and Book Reviews.
- Tier 2: Frontiers Commentaries.

Short peer reviews differ from full peer reviews mainly in two aspects: they are directly forwarded to the Interactive Review phase and they may be
reviewed by the Associate Editor alone. It is up to the Associate Editor’s consideration if further reviewers are invited to the review process.
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