

## A Note from the Editor

The lateness of the current issue is due to a lack of publishable manuscripts. Consequently, printing had to be delayed four months until at least two articles were accepted and completed for publication. We apologize to all of our subscribers who expected to receive the third issue of volume 5 in December.

The *JSH* received and reviewed 56 manuscripts between November, 1977 and January, 1979. The editorial board accepted one article outright, accepted 3 articles after minor changes, required 27 to be resubmitted with major change, and rejected 25 outright. Of the 27 manuscripts requiring resubmission, only 5 authors chose to do so, and of those, 3 were accepted, 1 was rejected, and 1 required a second resubmission. In sum, the *JSH* has accepted 7 manuscripts, rejected 26, while 23 remain in the resubmission category. It should be noted that this acceptance/rejection ratio parallels that of other history journals.

All publication decisions are made after an anonymous review by at least three members of the editorial board and are relayed to authors in one of four possible ways: (1) acceptance; (2) conditional acceptance, pending revisions; (3) revision and resubmission; or (4) rejection. In the case of a decision to accept pending revisions, the editor usually determines if the author's changes meet the board's requests. In the case of resubmission, the article is treated as a new submission and is reread and rediscussed. Each contributor is provided with a rationale for the decision reached; for conditional acceptances and resubmissions the author is also given detailed instructions for improving the manuscript.

The time elapsed between the receipt of a manuscript by the *JSH* and notification of a decision to the author has usually been six to eight weeks. As one can see from the past *JSH* record, an article accepted will appear in the next issue and at the present time, there is no backlog of manuscripts accepted for publication. Indeed, that is the major problem confronting the *JSH*—establishing a pool of quality articles to insure continuous and prompt publication.

As editor, I am concerned about the high percentage of "resubmission requested" articles which are never returned, despite the fact that the referees who analyzed the paper always offered suggestions for improve-

ment, in some cases provided further references for authors and, on occasion, rewrote portions of manuscripts.

Without exception, the major reasons for revision, resubmission, or rejection have been the failure to ask important and meaningful questions and the lack of careful research based upon primary source materials. Rarely has an article been rejected because of the topic chosen. It has usually been rejected because of the way the topic was treated. That is, the editorial board demands that researchers conform to the canons of historical methodology and high standards of scholarship. Additionally, the board expects that authors will follow the submission guidelines which are clearly stated in each issue.

Since the present issue concludes the first volume under my editorship, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the section editors and the members of the editorial board who perform most of the labor preparing each issue. Additionally, I would like to extend my appreciation to the following external reviewers who reacted to one or more manuscripts over the past year: Thomas L. Altherr, Bruce Bennett, Richard W. Etulain, Lawrence Fielding, Erich Geldbach, Maxwell Howell, Reet Howell, J. Thomas Jable, Mary H. Leigh, Archibald Lewis, Roberta J. Park, Michael Salter, Kohsuke Sasjima, Ronald A. Smith, and Paula Welch.

Jack W. Berryman  
Seattle, Washington