

Editorial

As always, changes are afoot in entomology. The news for this journal is that coeditor Frank Krell is relocating from London (The Natural History Museum) to become the Curator of Entomology in the Department of Zoology at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science. From the appearance of this issue of *Systematic Entomology*, the postal address of 2001 Colorado Boulevard, Denver, CO 80205-5798, USA and E-mail: of Frank.Krell@dmns.org should be used for those that submit their manuscripts to the journal concerning Coleoptera, or from a first author's address in the Palaearctic. That is, the two editors will continue to partition the world of entomology as they have since 2003. The Royal Entomology Society has accepted that for the first time neither editor of their systematics journal is located in the UK. We are unsure what, if any, significance attaches to this situation; one downside surely is the greater difficulty in attending annual meetings of all RES journal editors and their Blackwell counterparts in the enterprise.

In 2006 we accepted near 50 (of 98 submitted) manuscripts into formal review. This reduction from previous years stems from a greater ruthlessness in rejecting papers that we editors believe have less likelihood of acceptance. Papers in this category often are shown to at least one of our advisory panelists for rapid advice, and we thank our board for their assistance in this and other matters. Of the papers that entered the system in the year 2005-6, the acceptance rate of about 50% naturally is higher than previously. Thus we published 32 original articles, of average length 22 pages (and maximum of 50 pages), 1 editorial, 2 technical notes and 8 book reviews. Statistics available to us concerning downloads from the Synergy site suggest that book reviews and opinion-editorials (op-eds in US parlance) are very popular, and we continue to seek enthusiastic and opinionated contributors. This is not to deny that our articles are not widely read, indeed despite our scepticism concerning Impact Factors in Taxonomy (Krell, 2002), we note a substantial increase in IF for 2005 (to 1.9) bringing us back to 6th in Entomology titles. The international reach of the journal continues: we have first authors located in the USA (11), Germany (4), France (3), two each from Japan, Sweden, UK, and one from each of Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, Pakistan, Russia and Spain. Amongst the many coauthors' nationalities are many of the above, plus Mexico and Singapore. Systematics is a global enterprise but there is always place for a regional study as long as it is interpreted within a wider framework. That one third of our published papers are written by first authors located in the USA is not problematic: we note that many coauthors emanate from a range of other countries and are studying in the US, for example, under the National

Science Foundation's PEET (Partnerships for Enhancing Expertise in Taxonomy) and, increasingly, the ToL (Tree of Life) scheme. Our journal, as does the entire enterprise of scientific publication, depends upon the goodwill of peer reviewers. In general we are very happy with the content and timeliness of reviewers' responses. However, some crucial reviews have needed much longer than normal, but improved the papers significantly. With a dwindling and over-worked expertise, maintaining the highest quality review system requires patience! We are confirmed in our belief that personal (to be precise, individualized E-mail:) requests to review generate predominantly positive responses and thus we will not adopt an impersonal program for automated review requests. We are especially eager to ask authors that have published with us in the recent past to act as reviewers in their field: however, there has been an increase in the number of such authors who decline to review for us, citing their being 'too busy'. Whilst this clearly differentiates them from the editors and our many amenable reviewers, persistent such responses are discouragingly antisocial. And while in a negative frame of mind, we encourage major professors (USA) or thesis supervisors (elsewhere) to take a more active role in preparing their graduate (postgraduate) students' papers for submission to journals. In most countries the 'major doorstopper' theses are being replaced by chapters destined for publication. Indeed, some Universities demand the thesis should comprise published, or 'accepted' papers, as the meat in a sandwich between an introduction and synthesis. Unfortunately what eventuates may be less than the traditional rigorous and voluminous tome, but does not approach the conciseness and targeted candidate for journal publication, being a hybrid, which is neither! We receive many, and publish several, of the products from student thesis research. Nearly all require substantial work by reviewers, editors and eventually one or more of the authors before approaching publishability. Senior authors names on such works implies acceptance that the work is considered suitable for submission; thus we feel justified in asking that they take responsibility for ensuring that it is so, prior to our viewing the work.

PETER S. CRANSTON & FRANK-THORSTEN KRELL

Reference

Krell, F.-T. (2002) Reasons why impact factors don't work for taxonomy. Its long-term relevance, few specialists and lack of core journals put it outside ISI criteria. *Nature*, **415**, 957.