EDITORIAL REPORT

M.J. Hartley

The “drop out” rate of papers this year has been very high. So many papers were offered initially that the committee had to turn down a number or ask authors to write joint papers. This still left about 100 papers which should have provided plenty of material for a good conference after the normal 20% “drop out”. However, less than half the papers offered and provisionally accepted were received. The majority were withdrawn at various stages but some just did not appear. A few were not accepted or arrived too late.

Such a high failure rate makes programme planning difficult as individual sessions lost 20-80% of the offered papers causing virtually collapse of some smaller sessions. The greatest tragedy, however, was the fact that we had to turn down papers initially because of excessive numbers only to find that more than half the authors to whom we allocated space failed to use it.

Of those papers that were submitted 54% were received on time with another 15% on the first two days of June. A few of the very late authors had the courtesy to keep me informed of progress but the rest gave the impression of showing little regard for the work involved in preparing the Proceedings.

A tremendous amount of unnecessary editorial time could be saved if authors would show consideration by reading their instructions and following them. Everything that is not written initially in the style used by the Society has to be changed. It would be far less arduous for the editor if each author would give more thought to presentation rather than expecting someone else to do his work. It would also be in authors’ interests not to antagonise the editor! Probably the most common faults are failure to write litres (I can be confused with 1), excessive use of capital letters especially in tables and incorrect punctuation and layout of references, both in the text and in reference lists.

I would like to thank all the referees who have worked fast and efficiently on papers submitted and the various people who have been roped into proof reading.