

### Consideration Fee: View I

It was with great interest that I read the editorial "Why A Consideration Fee?" in the February 1978 issue of the *Journal*. I was quite shocked to learn that only a relatively small percentage of authors who publish in the *Journal* actually remit for page charges. I was under the impression that the percentage was higher. I agree wholeheartedly with the editorial in that page charges should actually be an integral part of the research project.

As one who has been associated with institutions that have supported page charges, I feel that the concept of a consideration fee is excellent and serves to distribute more evenly the cost of publication.

It is also difficult for me to understand why 75% of *Journal* readers are unwilling to pay reasonable subscription costs for personal copies. The charge is not that great.

I normally do not take the time to respond to editorials. However, I felt you might wish to share my comments with some of your colleagues at APhA or with your readers and to let them know that I wholeheartedly endorse the contents of the editorial.

John J. Sciarra  
Arnold & Marie Schwartz College of  
Pharmacy and Health Sciences of Long  
Island University  
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Received April 29, 1978.

---

### Consideration Fee: View II

The February 1978 editorial ("Why A Consideration Fee?") in this *Journal* by Dr. Mary Ferguson presents a rather cogent argument, from the editor's side, to support the recently instituted \$25 manuscript consideration fee. In fairness, we should hear from the other side, namely, those junior and senior researchers trying desperately to keep research projects financially afloat. I think I can speak for this group.

Dr. Ferguson asks the question as to who receives the most benefit from publication of papers. Her response excludes the *Journal* from this benefit because of a deficit budget, so, in her opinion, benefit accrues to authors and sponsoring institutions. This observation probably is correct but misses a few other important considerations. Could it be that major benefit accrues to APhA as the publisher of the *Journal* (these benefits may be in terms of prestige and recognition—

the same as Dr. Ferguson claims are accrued to authors and sponsoring institutions)? Could it be that benefit accrues to authors who refuse to pay page charges (as Dr. Ferguson explains, 40% of the articles published in *J. Pharm. Sci.* are published without payment of page charges)? Could it also be that in instituting page charges and consideration fees the *Journal* is alienating those very individuals that it must rely upon for its very existence?

The problem as I see it is whoever said that the *Journal* should be self-sufficient. Isn't it a reasonable argument that APhA should subsidize the *Journal* for dissemination of scientific information by APhA members (and nonmembers)? Is it unreasonable for my professional association to provide this subsidy in the amount of \$45,000 for 1977 (to use Dr. Ferguson's figures)? This subsidy amounts to \$4.50 for each subscribing and, ostensibly, in the main, APhA member. My and my colleague's APhA yearly dues should adequately provide for this subsidy since there are few other benefits that the scientific members of APhA can enjoy. The most apropos analogy would be to consider *American Pharmacy*; surely it publishes at a deficit to provide a needed membership benefit to practitioners of pharmacy.

R. Saul Levinson  
Health Sciences Center  
University of Oklahoma  
Oklahoma City, OK 73190

Received May 10, 1978.

---

### Plant Reidentified

In the August 1977 issue of this *Journal*, an article entitled "Plant Anticancer Agents III: Isolation of Indole and Bisindole Alkaloids from *Tabernaemontana holstii* Roots" appeared<sup>1</sup>. Since the time of publication, the plant has been reidentified by Dr. Robert E. Perdue, Dr. Arthur S. Barclay, and Sandra Saufferer of the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Md., as *Voacanga thouarsii* R. and S. (Apocynaceae).

David G. I. Kingston  
Department of Chemistry  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute  
and State University  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Received May 8, 1978.

<sup>1</sup> D. G. I. Kingston, B. T. Li, and F. Ionescu, *J. Pharm. Sci.*, **66**, 1135 (1977).