

Editorial

From time to time authors of papers submitted to the Journal of Power Sources (in common with contributors to other journals) run into some difficulty in deciding how best to present their work in order to achieve the optimum contribution to the scientific literature. In the present note we seek to set out our view of the philosophy underlying the structure and purpose of scientific publishing and to point out a number of criteria for additions to the body of literature which stem from this view.

The principal objective of the scientific literature is that it should be the secure repository of the growing body of scientific knowledge. The 'literature' should provide a clear view of the current status of any branch of knowledge and can thus be used by active workers as a vital tool in the design of ongoing studies. In order to be of maximum usefulness it is important that published literature should be readily comprehensible to non-specialists in the subject field.

This purpose can be achieved only if the following three broad criteria are adopted for material contributed to the publication process:

1. A manuscript must describe new science. It should add to the 'tree of knowledge'. Duplication serves only to clutter the published literature and in some cases can lead to copyright problems.
2. The subject material must be good science, containing no errors of fact or logic.
3. Papers must be written in the clearest, most precise, language possible. All terms need to be clearly defined and specialist jargon must be avoided.

These are general criteria for acceptability embraced by all respectable scientific publications. In addition, individual journals adopt their own distinctive style and presentation requirements. In the case of Journal of Power Sources these are set out in the Guide for Authors document, which is reproduced inside the back cover of every issue of the Journal.

Authors who adhere to both the general acceptability criteria (1–3 above) and to the detailed instructions in the Guide for Authors should experience no difficulty in the reviewing process.

C.K. Dyer, P.T. Moseley, Z. Ogumi
D.A.J. Rand, B. Scrosati