
Organic Process

Research &

Development

Organic Process Research & Development 2000, 4, 439

Editorial

Whilst reading a *Tetrahedron Letters* paper, which described difficulty in reproducing an organic synthesis preparation, I mused on the problems development chemists and engineers often have in repeating reactions, either from the literature or from procedures provided by colleagues in a different department. Of course, the key is the quality of the experimental write up and the attention to detail. Published procedures only document the successful experiment and the best yield, not the failed experiments. Most of us, I suspect, were never taught how to write up our experimental work at university, yet the majority of published procedures rely on students' and postdoctoral workers' notebooks for their Experimental Section. It is uncommon for university notebooks to document the source of the reagents used and their quality, whereas all development chemists know that this is crucial (for example, the quality of zinc used in Reformatsky reactions). If there are errors in existing publications, then OPR & D, would be interested to hear of these, and corrections could be published as a short note, particularly if the resultant procedure has been scaled up. This would be a useful service to development chemists.

Academic readers should note that the experimental procedures published in OPR & D have probably been repeated many times by several workers prior to scale up, and their reproducibility, whilst not actually guaranteed, should be better than most other journals. These are, therefore, the experimental procedures of choice to give undergraduates or postgraduates for teaching purposes. The only criticism might be that procedures are often too concentrated to run smoothly on a 50 mg scale!

The last issue of OPR & D continued our second "themed" issue on Crystallisation and Polymorphism, the first being on Oligonucleotide Synthesis. The themed issues for 2001 will be on "Automation in Process R & D" and, second, "Continuous Processes in Fine Chemical/Pharmaceutical Manufacture". The "automation" issue will probably be the March/April issue of 2001, and submissions for this are required as soon as possible. The editor (Trevor Laird) is coordinating this issue (or, more accurately, his assistant, Claire Davey, is doing all the work!). Please contact Claire if you have possible papers for this issue. The second themed issue is being coordinated by Dinesh Gala of Schering Plough, and potential authors should discuss with him, or with the editor, about the details of this issue. Referees/reviewers are required for both special issues—volunteers (with experience in automation or continuous processes and who are *not* already on our reviewers' list should contact Claire Davey/Trevor Laird at claire@scientificupdate.co.uk).

Finally, I wish to personally thank Richard Pariza, who has recently resigned as U.S. Editor of the journal, for all of his efforts in getting the journal off the ground in the mid-1990s, but also for his editorial contributions in the past few years. He will continue his work for the journal as an active member of the Editorial Advisory Board, which meets at least twice each year. EAB meetings would not be the same without Richard's lively comments often of a humorous nature!

Trevor Laird
Editor

OP000104U