

## Galley Proof Intrigues

I HAVE some good news and some bad news to report as I begin my annual musing on the state of the journal. Bad news first. Yes, we had been having a problem in the preparation of manuscripts. This was attributable to two actions taken in conjunction with the move of AIAA Headquarters to Washington, D.C. First, and probably most important, we have an all-new editorial and production staff. Second, we have new and more modern production equipment. The teething problems, both human and mechanical, more than used up the pad we had planned on by typesetting papers in advance. I believe that the transition is largely behind us. This journal is now back on schedule. The production and editorial staffs are up to planned strength and they have sufficient experience that the mistakes that were inevitable earlier are no longer common. This should become apparent to authors in two ways: 1) A reduction of production delays and 2) galley proofs with fewer errors.

Many of you telephoned and asked me to look into problems associated with poor-quality galley proofs. In examining some of these cases, I discovered there are a number of things an author can do to reduce the chances for delays or problems after the paper is accepted by the technical editors and forwarded to the production staff for publication. Perhaps the following "letter" will help you understand some of these issues. For those of you who may not have read it, I suggest you read a previous letter, "How to Have Your Paper Returned," which was published in the January/February 1987 issue of the *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*.

Dear Mom:

I have been so busy that I have not been able to write to you for two years. In my last letter I explained my frustrations with the technical editors of the *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics* because they were interfering with my opportunities for career advancement. Well, I have good news. They finally accepted my paper! (After making me revise it three times) I thought it would help get me a promotion but—not yet! These \*!/\* technical editors have behind them a managing editor, a senior editor, an editorial assistant, copy editors, and production people, all of whom obviously attended the same school for training on how to interfere with authors. The galley proofs of my paper are covered with marks and questions. As you know, my paper was elegant. It was full of beautiful mathematics. Apparently, the AIAA editors did not appreciate this. They claimed the mathematical notation was overly complex and I must either simplify it or add a nomenclature section. They do not seem to recognize I already eliminated the nomenclature in order to meet their ridiculously small 36-unit length limit. Additionally, since my personal computer only handles Greek, Cyrillic, Arabic, and English symbols, I inserted some of my more exotic symbols in handwritten form. They claimed that they did not have these and that some of them were illegible. Now I have to go back and completely redo my mathematical expressions. They also took objection to my emphasizing the beauty of some of my conclusions with italic and boldface print. They thought that my use of these type styles was excessive and demanded that I eliminate them. To make matters worse, I had a few of them in my 20-word title. Now they are insisting that my title must not exceed 12 words.

By the time they had finished marking up my list of references, I almost could not read what was there in the first place. Their complaints seemed to revolve around AIAA's archival journal style. I called them to discuss this, telling them that some of the references they had marked were really not that important so why didn't they leave them alone. Would you believe they were rude enough to suggest that if they weren't important why were they in the paper in the first place? After a lengthy discussion along these lines, I agreed to fix them according to some silly rule that the readers of the paper must be able to obtain the reference easily and that sufficient information must be there for the readers to do so. I thought this would

end the subject—not to be. I put in a number of references in the list that I did not cite in the paper. (This helps create the aura that I completely know the subject.) They insisted that all references be cited in the text. Next, they suggested that several of the figures and tables could be eliminated from the paper because I never cited them in the text. Between the extra references and the figures and tables, I was sure I would get that promotion; now I have to eliminate them all. (But I suppose I'll have room for the nomenclature now.)

They particularly seemed upset about my Abstract, Introduction, and Conclusions section. Something about the fact that they repeated each other. As a matter of fact, the senior editor told me that I had verbatim repeated some of the sections. I tried to explain to her about the beautifully symmetric paper but she would not listen. Now I have to rewrite all three. The Abstract will have to encapsulate the purpose of the paper, the Introduction will have to put the paper in proper context with previously published work, and the Conclusions will have to be conclusions that can actually be drawn from the paper itself. Moreover, they insist that the conclusions stand alone and do not use any equations or references or even refer back to the text. They also insist that the Conclusions section be conclusions and not just a simple summary of the paper.

Finally, they complained about the quality of my beautiful figures. After all of the revisions they put me through, I had reproduced them numerous times. They claimed that I had done this so often that the writing on them was illegible. Now they demand that I find the original figures and send them and insist that they be good, high contrast figures. I don't know whether I will ever finish this project!

Well, I suppose you can see that life goes on and that nothing has changed. I hope the next time I write I can report on all of the excitement that came from the publication of my paper in the *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*.

Love,  
Your Son

That letter gives you some idea of a few of the problems we encounter that often wind up causing delays for authors. Please read and respond to the queries on galleys. Failure to do so could necessitate another iteration and delay the publication of your paper.

Please also remember that we are now accepting photographs and biographies for full-length papers. When originally submitting your paper, or when sending the associate editor your revision, provide a glossy black-and-white photograph and a short biography of each of the authors if you choose to have such information published with your article. For our guidelines and rules on this subject, consult page 2 of the January/February 1988 issue of the *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*.

It is time once again to say goodbye to some valued colleagues. Professor John Junkins and Dr. Joe Bossi have completed their tours as Associate Editor and have left the masthead of this publication. Both are conscientious and valued colleagues and I would like to publicly thank them for their efforts on behalf of this journal. Our new editors will be Professor John Cochran of Auburn University, Dr. Bernard Friedland of Kearfott Guidance and Navigation Corporation, and Dr. Jer-Nan Juang of NASA Langley Research Center. I welcome them and look forward to working with them for the next several years.

The following is a list of some very important volunteers—our reviewers. These are names of those who have helped us from October 1, 1987 through September 30, 1988. Without their efforts this journal or any like it would not be possible. My personal thanks to all on the list.

Donald C. Fraser  
Editor-in-Chief