

# Editorial

## Electronic Submission of Papers

This is the first issue of POAS in which we have used only electronic submission. The authors were given detailed instructions and several options. All of them chose to provide the final version of their "manuscripts" either on a disk or as an email submission. Since several major publishers are now using this procedure we wanted to try it. This procedure did reduce our workload. I now share some comments from authors concerning electronic submission.

"Again, I can only wish that this electronic submission procedure of yours becomes more widely used. The end result of cleaner galleys can only mean fewer errors in the final product". Frederick B. Stangl, Jr.,  
Midwestern State University.

"This is the first time in over 20 years of publishing more than 50 papers that I have not made corrections in galley proof. My congratulations to you on a remarkable accomplishment and to electronic submission". David T. John OSU-COM

"In regards to your question of what I think about the electronic submission procedure — if it means less work for you and your staff, then I certainly support it". David Bass, UCO.

## The Joys and Pains of Editorship

A major joy is in seeing the volume completed and delivered to the subscribers while maintaining quality. Another joy is in working with an author to improve the clarity of presentation and having the author realize that the editorial process is not punishment. Pains come from reviewers and authors who take out their frustrations on the editor, who is the intermediate link.

Not all articles are clearly written, with the presented data unequivocally establishing the conclusions. The editor is not expert in most research areas which the manuscripts represent. That is why there are reviewers who add their expertise and differing opinions to the review process. The editor bases the first evaluation on these reviews, but since they come from several reviewers, the different opinions must be reconciled. The author then has the opportunity to respond to the review comments (including some from the editor). The editor then must decide if the points have been answered or if another review is required. Reviewers get frustrated when authors don't respond to their questions. Authors are frustrated with having to answer those questions.

The whole purpose of the review process is to maintain the quality of science and to publish clear reports.

## Public Support

Since most of us are not like the scientists of old who were independently wealthy and could afford to do science as a hobby, we must depend on public or foundation support for our research. The general public does not understand the nature of science. They are confused by the press playing up certain "discoveries" without regard to the true value or alternative interpretation of the data. They become confused when politics are mixed with science and when political and religious leaders betray honesty. With the shortage of support scientists become more competitive and lose the true rewards. These perilous times require each of us to maintain the integrity of science.

*Franklin R. Leach*

## A Reminder from the Executive Secretary–Treasurer

Please examine the code following your name on the mailing label; the last two digits of that code typically will be 93, 94, 95, representing the year through which your membership is paid. If these last two digits are less than 95, IT'S TIME TO RENEW; see page 62.

*ENN*