When we decided, together with the publishers Carlotta Zucchini and Nicola Leonardi, to launch the *TPJ* a couple of years ago, we had clear in mind that this new research platform had to help bridge the gap between the academy and the profession. Increasingly (and it is a positive change of our time, as I tried to to discuss elsewhere¹), cutting-edge research is being conducted also in practice, at firms of every size, and academic inquiry has fortunately left, for the most part, the “ivory tower.” Therefore, it should come with no surprise that we have featured, over the first issues of the journal, research studies originated from (or orienting) practice works. In this issue in particular, we host reflections by experienced practitioners (such as Jacques Ferrier, Carol Ross Barney, Eric Gartner and Claudio Aldegheri), as well as by a critic/scholar with a research-driven emerging practice (such as conrad-bercah). Also more speculative studies, such as the typological investigations by Riccardo Zuliani and Brunella Angeli, the re-assessment of Fernand Pouillon’s cultural and professional legacy by Emilio Mossa, or the investigations by Mary Pat McGuire on landscape issues and techniques relative to the growing problem of urban hardscapes, or even the inquiry by Mahesh Daas and Andrew Wit into the challenges and opportunities being unfolded by the development of robotics in architecture, are all research efforts with clear implications on architectural, urbanistic and design practice.

A more theoretical spin is offered on the other hand by the book/exhibition/conference review section, ranging from the book *The Building*, edited by José Aragüez (through the critique of Christophe Van Gerrewey), to the exhibition on Donald Judd’s architectural projects (by Kyle May and Julia van den Hout), and to my reviews of the 2017 Chicago Architecture Biennial and the 2017 *Rising* conference in Aarhus, Denmark.
It is our conviction that the dialogue between academy and practice need to be nurtured and promoted, and the *TPJ* wants to do just that.

With this issue, in addition to peer-reviewed research, we also start to host contributions (solicited by, or proposed to, the journal) that the editorial office deem as not requiring peer-review. These are, in fact, contributions that have gone already through extensive peer-recognition (such as the numerous awards received by Ross Barney’s study on Chicago), or that come from well renowned authors whose works have been already widely peer-recognized (such as the Rouen project by Ferrier). However, true to our mission as a primarily peer-review journal, we intend for peer-review contributions to still constitute the vast majority of the journal’s contents. Consequently, from this issue, we have started to clearly mark as such the peer-reviewed contributions.

We hope that this articulation of the contents will further enrich and expand the cultural offer of the journal, to address the ever wider range of interests of our readers.

---
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