

Editorial | Received 28 December 2025; Revised 29 December 2025;
Accepted 29 December 2025; Published 30 December 2025
<https://doi.org/10.55092/opr20250003>

Illuminating the shadow: a new vision for photonics publishing



L. Jay Guo

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA; E-mail: guo@umich.edu

It is a fair question to ask: does the community truly need another journal in the bustling, highly saturated field of optics and photonics? When the landscape of optical publishing is already as densely packed as WDM, the justification for a new entrant must go beyond merely providing another venue. While we remain committed to the highest standards of peer-reviewed rigor for cutting-edge optical research, this journal was founded on the belief that the current format of scientific storytelling is incomplete. We tend to publish the destination, but we rarely map the journey.

Standard publications often present a sanitized, linear narrative: a hypothesis, followed by a seamless method, and a pristine result. However, every experimentalist in the lab knows that science is rarely linear. It's a messy, oscillatory process filled with noise, and serendipity. By hiding these struggles, we deprive the community of crucial institutional knowledge. To address this, we're proud to introduce a distinct and dedicated session titled "Lessons Learned."

In this unique section, we invite authors to step out from behind the passive voice and share the unvarnished journey of discovery. We want to hear about the failed experiments that refined your hypothesis, the optical setup that refused to stabilize until a counter-intuitive fix was applied, and the "negative" results that are just as scientifically valid as the positive ones. This isn't just anecdotal; it's educational. A record of what *didn't* work is often the most efficient tool for saving a fellow researcher months of redundant effort.

Ultimately, our goal is to foster a culture of transparency that accelerates innovation. By documenting the "human" element of high-precision science—the grit, the errors, and the course corrections—we hope to transform individual stumbling blocks into steppingstones for the entire community. We invite you to submit not just your triumphs, but also paths leading to your triumphs.

OPR call for papers

Theme: Beyond the Perfect Result—Documenting the True Path to Discovery

Optics and Photonics Research invites you to submit to a groundbreaking new section dedicated to the unspoken reality of optical engineering and photonics research.



Copyright©2025 by the authors. Published by ELSP. This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

We believe that a lab notebook contains two types of value: the data that validates a hypothesis, and the hard-won experience gained from the experiments that didn't. For too long, scientific publishing has focused only on the former. We are changing that.

Why submit to OPR

In the high-precision world of optics and photonics, a “failed” experiment often teaches us more than a successful one. By providing the section on “Lessons Learned”, you contribute to a collective wisdom that:

- Saves Time: Prevent fellow researchers from repeating dead-end methodologies.
- Humanizes Science: Showcase the ingenuity required to overcome alignment drifts, material defects, and noise floor limitations.
- Valorizes “Dark Data”: Get citable credit for the rigorous work that usually ends up in the recycling bin because it yielded a negative result.

What we are looking for the “lessons learned”

We are not looking for “bad science”; we are looking for rigorous science that took an unexpected turn. We welcome Case Studies, Technical Letters and Reviews covering:

- Negative Results: Well-designed experiments that definitively proved what *doesn't* work.
- Troubleshooting Chronicles: Unique solutions to complex optical alignment, isolation, or fabrication challenges that aren't detailed in standard method sections.
- Methodological Detours: Approaches that were theoretically sound but practically unviable, and the physics explaining why.
- The “Lucky” Mistake: Serendipitous discoveries born from errors in setup or calculation.

Review criteria

Submissions to “Optics and Photonics Research” undergo full peer review. However, reviewers are instructed to evaluate based on:

- Novelty: Does this contribute to a new finding or a new process?
- Utility: Does this provide actionable insight to the community?
- Rigor: Is the failure or result well-characterized and understood?
- Clarity: Is the narrative of the methodology, analysis, and “lesson” clear and educational?

Submission details

- Format: Concise manuscripts (suggested length: 1500–3000 words).
- Structure: Must include a distinct “The Lesson” distinct conclusion.