It is with great joy and satisfaction that we come to publish the seventh issue of Transversal: International Journal for the Historiography of Science. As we assess this short pathway to help guide our plans to the near future, we realize that this work is comprised of about one hundred authors from 21 countries with 65 articles, 5 interviews, and 14 book reviews. These issues published during this short period have encouraged us to plan new special dossiers – such as the next one on the historiography of physics – and to edit and publish articles and book reviews we continuously receive for publication in other sections of the journal. This tremendous international collaboration – not only from authors, but also from referees – promotes an intense exchange of ideas among us all, readers, authors, referees, and editors. Indeed, this is a massive movement that piques our curiosity and enthusiasm and keeps going on this editorial journey.

According to the journal’s proposal, the articles published have focused on the critical reconstruction of the history of historiography and analyze the great diversity of authors, issues, and traditions of the historiography of science. We aspire to offer more than just a place for academic publication and strive to exchange ideas via the editorial process. We hope that all the material produced – which is freely available on the journal’s website – can be a permanent resource to readers, researchers, and others interested in the area. Thus, in this way, we hope to extend this editorial project to all the community of historiography of science.

As readers can see, while our journal’s focus is on promoting reflections on the historiography of science, we have also published articles on the history of science in almost equal proportion. Therefore, our journal is open to receive articles on the historiography of science and history of science.

In this seventh issue, we present articles analyzing the scientific revolution, the history of physics, and the history of mathematics, as well as a reevaluation of the neopositivist interpretation of vitalism. We wish you, dear reader, a great read.