EDITORIAL REPORT

M. J. HARTLEY

It appears the congratulations I conveyed to authors last year for improvement in promptness of submission of papers has led to complacency. This year only 33% of the papers were submitted in time and even this was marred by slow re-submission after editing in many cases. Late submission, coupled with a staffing problem at the printers, put the pre-prints in serious jeopardy at one stage. However, we finally made it within one day of the original target date.

There was generally less problem this year with over length papers and some complicated tables were offered in a form suitable for block making which saved difficult type setting.

It would be greatly appreciated if authors would read and follow the instruction given. It would save a lot of unnecessary editing time if authors would comply with simple requirements such as underlining scientific names and giving rates in kg/ha.

I initiated a system this year whereby authors were asked to supply a list of all pesticides mentioned in the papers in order to save someone else having to do the job. I suppose I should be satisfied with a 65% return but I would have liked better.

Most authors were prepared to receive, and even welcomed, editorial criticism in the manner in which it was intended. However, some authors object to any criticism. I feel this is short sighted but that is up to the authors. Authors can be assured that editorial criticism is impersonal and made solely in the interest of the standard of our publication.
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