



## EDITORIAL

### *Change of paper, 1997*

Readers will notice the 'new look' to JSG this year: a change to glossy paper, throughout. This is a distinct change from our previous style, since the beginning (1979), where a distinction was made between lighter-weight paper for text and line drawings, and coated pages 'tipped in' to the Journal for photographic figures (halftones). This has remained the most convenient and economic style of production for many years, allowing us to maximise resources to give the best reproduction quality for photographic images. However, when we reviewed the policy in 1996, in the context of new production methods and other minor changes, we decided in favour of one type of coated paper for all JSG pages. This comes with the Publisher's assurance that our photographic figures, such as micrographs and field photographs, will be reproduced to the same quality as before. The quality of text reproduction and line diagrams, particularly shading, should actually improve. The *Instructions for Contributors* (see end of this issue) have been modified for 1997 to include this style change, and other minor changes discussed in the next section.

The change of paper offers authors and editors a more flexible approach to figure arrangement and numbering, as it is no longer necessary to group photographic figures together into full-page arrangements on consecutive pages. We can now more easily accommodate single small photographs, and collections of photographs with interpretive line drawings, and can expect less wasted page space through blank pages. Authors working on new papers, or revising manuscripts, may wish to consider this style change when assembling their illustrations. The papers already in production will have the previous style of separate page arrangements of photographs, but this remains a sensible option where many halftones are required. The change to glossy paper throughout does not indicate a relaxation of the limit on pages of photographs, and is not intended to encourage large numbers of separate halftones to be produced among text, where groups of photographs might still be more practical.

### *Other Journal style changes*

My previous Editorial (Vol. 18 No. 9) provided an update on new electronic production methods, and mentioned the need to change some minor aspects of JSG's traditional style to suit the Elsevier standard. The

most notable change is in style of citations and references. In the text, references now appear in the style of (Ramsay and Huber, 1987; Hobbs *et al.*, 1990). This style will already be familiar to many authors. In the reference list, names of periodicals should now be written out in full, and parentheses will appear around the year. Both these changes are clarified in the new *Instructions for Contributors* at the end of this issue, and examples given. Authors of papers already written and in review or production need not be concerned about making style changes. The software that converts authors' disk versions into electronic files will default to this style, which is the principal reason for making the change. However, authors preparing new manuscripts for submission are asked to follow the new style for references, if possible.

### *Packaging of manuscripts*

Many authors would be horrified to see the state of their packages of new manuscripts, when they arrive on my desk as submissions to JSG! The New Year is perhaps the most risky time for survival of envelopes and their contents, because of the seasonal increase and delay of mail, and backlogs arising because of holiday closures. The manuscript-size envelopes used by many universities all over the world — whether white paper or brown — are commonly not strong enough to carry three bulky manuscripts for JSG. There are interesting structural problems here: examples of echelon tears on long edges of white envelopes; general weakening of edges of grey or brown paper; occasional opening of seams and seals. While it is probably true that the worst damage over the years has affected packages from Australia, distance is not the principal factor. I commonly receive manuscripts spilling out from brown envelopes from British universities just an hour's drive away. However, before authors reach indiscriminately for their staplers and rolls of sticky tape, please spare a thought for how the Editor might open the package. In company with all the shredded envelopes received this week was a stout padded bag from America that was completely coated in sellotape, covering staples, the opening strip, and all access points. Opening it required the severest surgery with a scalpel, and left me and the precious manuscript covered in grey paper dust from the spilt padding. I therefore urge moderation and common sense. If a vastly reinforced packet is required, authors might first consider whether they have exceeded the advised length limit for JSG! For

an average-sized contribution, the best protection is something strong, waterproof and flexible. The worst damage may actually occur from the contents themselves (with no prejudgment of the science intended!), caused by heavy manuscript copies sliding about in the envelope during mail handling. So probably the safest form of packaging is two layers: an inner-envelope or plastic bag containing the three manuscripts, and a strong close-fitting outer envelope. As with field clothing, several

removable layers are more user-friendly than a single sealed space suit!

I welcome readers' comments on the *Journal of Structural Geology* and its policies, at all times, and hope the changes for 1997 meet with general approval.

*Susan H. Treagus*  
*January 1997*