

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Insecta Mundi

Center for Systematic Entomology, Gainesville,  
Florida

---

April 2007

## ***Insecta Mundi*: procedures, production, and publication**

Paul E. Skelley

*Florida State Collection of Arthropods, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services,  
Gainesville, FL*

Michael C. Thomas

*Florida State Collection of Arthropods, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services,  
Gainesville, FL*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/insectamundi>



Part of the [Entomology Commons](#)

---

Skelley, Paul E. and Thomas, Michael C., "*Insecta Mundi*: procedures, production, and publication" (2007).  
*Insecta Mundi*. 53.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/insectamundi/53>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Systematic Entomology, Gainesville, Florida at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Insecta Mundi by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# INSECTA MUNDI

A Journal of World Insect Systematics

---

0001

*Insecta Mundi*: procedures, production, and publication

Paul E. Skelley and Michael C. Thomas  
Florida State Collection of Arthropods  
Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
P. O. Box 147100  
Gainesville FL 32614-7100

Date of Issue: 25 April 2007

Paul E. Skelley and Michael C. Thomas  
Insecta Mundi: procedures, production, and publication  
Insecta Mundi 0001: 1-7

**Published in 2007 by**

Center for Systematic Entomology, Inc.  
P. O. Box 147100  
Gainesville, FL 32604-7100 U. S. A.  
<http://www.centerforsystematicentomology.org/>

**Insecta Mundi** is a journal primarily devoted to insect systematics, but articles can be published on any non-marine arthropod taxon. Manuscripts considered for publication include, but are not limited to, systematic or taxonomic studies, revisions, nomenclatural changes, faunal studies, book reviews, phylogenetic analyses, biological or behavioral studies, etc. **Insecta Mundi** is widely distributed, and referenced or abstracted by several sources including the Zoological Record, CAB Abstracts, etc.

As of 2007, **Insecta Mundi** is published irregularly throughout the year, not as a quarterly issues. As manuscripts are completed they are published and given an individual number. Manuscripts must be peer reviewed prior to submission, after which they are again reviewed by the editorial board to insure quality. One author of each submitted manuscript must be a current member of the Center for Systematic Entomology.

**Managing editor:** Paul E. Skelley, e-mail: [skellep@doacs.state.fl.us](mailto:skellep@doacs.state.fl.us)

**Production editor:** Michael C. Thomas, e-mail: [thomasm@doacs.state.fl.us](mailto:thomasm@doacs.state.fl.us)

**Printed copies deposited in libraries of:**

CSIRO, Canberra, ACT, Australia  
Museu de Zoologia, São Paulo, Brazil  
Agriculture and Agrifood Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada  
The Natural History Museum, London, England  
Muzeum I Instytut Zoologii Pan, Warsaw, Poland  
National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan  
California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, CA, USA  
Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Gainesville, FL, USA  
Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, IL, USA  
National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, USA

**Electronic copies in PDF format:**

Printed CD mailed to all members at end of year.  
Florida Center for Library Automation: [purl.fcla.edu/fcla/insectamundi](http://purl.fcla.edu/fcla/insectamundi)

**Author instructions** available on the Insecta Mundi page at:

<http://www.centerforsystematicentomology.org/insectamundi/>

ISSN 0749-6737

---

## ***Insecta Mundi*: procedures, production, and publication**

Paul E. Skelley and Michael C. Thomas

Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services- DPI

Florida State Collection of Arthropods

P. O. Box 147100

Gainesville FL 32614-7100

skellep@doacs.state.fl.us

thomasm@doacs.state.fl.us

**Abstract.** This article outlines changes in procedures and production policies for the journal *Insecta Mundi*. Background data and discussions leading to these necessary changes are explained. Updated instructions for authors are presented. A full current version of author instructions will be posted on the latest Center for Systematic Entomology URL.

### **Introduction**

With the coming of the electronic age and changes in the financial environment, many small scientific societies are threatened. In general, we are in the midst of an age of potential mass extinction. We must adapt to these new conditions or go extinct. Changes in a journal publication format, while subtle on the production side, lead to many tangential problems elsewhere that can be catastrophic for the whole. All aspects must be carefully considered and issues resolved. We hope the following account helps explain recent events and how we have decided to change to survive in the current environment.

### **Our Dilemma**

The Center for Systematic Entomology, Inc. (CSE) is a non-profit, scientific society which operates solely on a volunteer basis. Our journal, *Insecta Mundi*, has always been produced by volunteer labor, and funded through reprint charges and membership fees to the CSE. Tasks of the society and journal have always fallen on a few dedicated members, one of whom was Ross Arnett, Jr., creator of several major entomological works and founder of *Insecta Mundi*. When Dr. Arnett died (1999), continuation of these endeavors fell upon those who produced *Insecta Mundi*. This was the beginning of a lag in printing the journal (some issues coming out the year following that stated in the running head).

Even though we struggled with scheduling, articles were printed within a year of submission (a delay shorter than for some journals), and we were able to do so inexpensively in terms of charges to authors. However, our time lag problem only worsened, as submissions diminished, possibly because of the time lag in production. Regardless of getting articles out rapidly and being inexpensive, we were falling farther behind in a cyclic situation: apparent time problems led to lack of submissions, and lack of enough manuscripts to fill an issue increased our apparent time lag in production. Another undesirable problem was the need to use almost every submission to fill issues. In order to accomplish this, editors and other volunteers worked diligently to improve some manuscripts to meet *Insecta Mundi* publication requirements. This work should have been done by the authors, but time restraints made this difficult.

Despite low publication charges, we received some large works for which the authors were ultimately unable to pay reprint or excess page charges. At the same time, costs for printing and mailing have risen greatly, and more than one separate (reprint) mailings have been lost in transit. In one case, the separates were reprinted at our cost. In short, the CSE was losing money in the production of *Insecta Mundi*, and the number of submissions remained low. Last year, the Board of Directors decided radical changes of policies and production were needed, or *Insecta Mundi* would cease publication.

A major function of the CSE is to serve systematics, not to make money. In this new age of technology, most of our problems can be resolved (or at least reduced) and systematics better served if we alter production to utilize more electronic methods and eliminate the large printing and mailing costs for each issue. With the recent success of other scientific journals, we debated many ideas relevant to electronic production, and have decided on what we believe are the best options for our situation.

## New General Policies

Paper publication of *Insecta Mundi* will be limited to 10 copies distributed to 10 international institutions. However, *Insecta Mundi* will also be disseminated by various electronic means, greatly increasing our ability to distribute copies of the journal to the world-wide audience. Publishing in this manner brings up concerns regarding the validity of the publication as considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. With these and many other concerns, we propose the following general policies for *Insecta Mundi*.

**Archival and Nomenclatural Concerns.** We do not trust anything electronic to be fully archival. Also, the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN 1999) has specific rules regarding journals produced electronically. Thus, we have decided to produce, distribute, and archive the journal in several ways. **1)** As articles are produced in PDF format, 10 copies will be printed on archival paper and deposited in 10 designated international institutions, establishing a date of publication. These institutions will be selected by the CSE's Board of Directors and listed on the cover page of every article. **2)** A PDF file will be posted on the CSE website for temporary accessibility of members. **3)** The same PDF file will be archived and available in the Florida Center for Library Automation (FCLA), <http://www.fcla.edu/>, which now hosts the *Florida Entomologist* (see <http://www.fcla.edu/FlaEnt/>). **4)** The CSE will maintain its own archives on various electronic media in multiple places, actively updating these as technologies change. **5)** At the end of each year, all CSE members will receive a pressed CD containing PDF files for all articles produced that year. **6)** Any institution or individual wishing to download a copy for archiving and printing for personal use may do so from the FCLA website. **7)** CDs of earlier volumes will be available for purchase, and eventually posted on the FCLA website for open access. Contact the managing editor for prices and availability.

We feel that maintaining all of the above production and distribution criteria will absolutely fulfill the ICZN rules for publication criteria (Article 8.1) by having simultaneously obtainable copies produced in a manner that assures numerous and identical durable copies. The date of publication is fixed by distribution of 10 printed copies physically mailed to 10 institutions.

**Production.** The most substantial change in production is that we will no longer print mass numbers on paper for distribution nor distribute paper reprints. We are a publishing entity to serve systematics, not a profit-making printing entity.

*Quarterly issues no longer produced.* Each article will be published individually and numbered sequentially. This will allow almost immediate publication. However, we require a minimum number of 20 printed pages to produce and bind the paper copies mailed to institutions (establishing publication date). Thus, articles less than 20 printed pages shall be published along with other articles to meet the minimum number of pages for a binding. We do not foresee this creating a time lag in production and should not hinder anyone from submitting short manuscripts.

*Scientific Notes no longer produced.* Scientific notes are often overlooked by indexing and abstracting services. Thus, all submissions, even if a single page, will be considered a full article and published as such.

*Color images accepted.* We can now produce in color at no extra cost, if color images are provided.

*Reprints no longer provided.* Authors will receive a free copy of their article(s) in PDF format, which they may distribute electronically or use to print hard copies. We will not provide paper reprints, nor require their purchase. Authors can easily print them at home or at a local copying business in whatever quantity or quality desired.

**Costs of Production.** To cover our (now greatly reduced) costs of production, we require that one author of any given manuscript be a CSE member the year the article is published. This entitles that author to 100 *Insecta Mundi* pages a year at no additional cost. If any author wishes to publish an article estimated at over 100 printed pages, they should contact the managing editor to discuss details, production methods, and costs.

**Distribution and availability.** With the advent of the electronic age, the abilities of the Internet, and changing practices of researchers, it is obvious that the best way to distribute articles and make them readily available is to post them on the World Wide Web. All articles will be posted the same day they are completed and the 10 paper copies are mailed. Members will be notified by e-mail as articles are published. Initially, articles will be made available on the CSE website and at the same time sent to the

Florida Center for Library Automation (FCLA) for open and free access. The FCLA posting may require a minor delay.

**Copyrights.** Historically and at present, articles published in *Insecta Mundi* are not copyrighted by the CSE. However, we follow general copyright licensing known as Creative Commons. By submitting and publishing articles in *Insecta Mundi*, authors have granted the CSE permission to make their article available through Internet posting and electronic dissemination, and otherwise archive the information contained both electronically and in a hard printed version. Any further copyright is held by the author(s). When used, information obtained from *Insecta Mundi* articles must be referenced and cited appropriately. Electronic or printed articles may be reproduced for personal, educational, or archival purposes, or any non-commercial use. Permission should be sought from the author(s) for multiple, non-commercial reproduction. Written permission from the author(s) is required for any commercial reproduction.

**Submission.** It is surprising how many manuscripts are received in poor condition. In the past, our editors have taken it upon themselves to correct problems when authors should have been required to fix them. Thus, several rigid rules will apply to submission of manuscripts for our consideration. If the editor or any member of the editorial committee deems a submission does not adhere to these rules (outlined below), the submission will be returned to the author for correction or rejected.

**Peer Review.** Having manuscripts reviewed after submission and getting authors to make corrections are the greatest causes for the delay in publication. Authors know best who can give competent reviews on their subject matter, yet they have grown accustomed to journals providing the review service. By requiring authors to obtain peer reviews prior to submission, we greatly reduce our production delays and still meet peer review requirements (see Appendix, What is Peer Review? by R. E. Woodruff).

All submitted manuscripts will be given to a member of the editorial board for final consideration of acceptability. The editors will rely on their knowledge of the subject matter as one step in the final decision-making process. Any manuscript not meeting our requirements, not deemed acceptable for publication, or that appears to have received poor or biased reviews, will be returned to the author for additional reviews or simply rejected.

## General Instructions to Authors

Arnett and Woodruff (1998) laid out many of our guidelines for authors, mostly following the CBE style manual (1994). However, with the new production policies, we are instigating some changes to the guidelines for authors preparing manuscripts, restating or updating them here.

1. All submissions must adhere to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN 1999, or more recent rules posted on their website).
2. Articles published free are limited in length to 100 printed pages. For longer articles, authors should contact the managing editor.
3. Submissions may be in English or Spanish. An English abstract is required for Spanish manuscripts.
4. The publisher will design, format, and assemble text and artwork for publication.
5. Each new taxon must be illustrated and included in a new key, or as an addendum to an existing key. The only exceptions to this rule are the publication of a replacement name for a homonym, or a new combination of a species or subspecies.
6. Type species of each new genus must be stated, with the manner of designation and reference to the designation.

## Manuscript Preparation Guidelines

1. General organization of submitted manuscripts: Title, Author(s) and contact information, Abstract (Resumen), Introduction, Text, Acknowledgments, Literature Cited, Figure Captions, Graphics (as separate files).
2. Titles should include the full taxonomic position of the taxa included: "(Coleoptera: Carabidae)". Genus and species names mentioned must include authors.

**3.** Abstract and Resumen should be brief, define the conclusion(s), and should contain full scientific names (including authors for genera and species).

**4.** Introductions should describe the scope and purpose (not a summary) of the manuscript.

**5.** Distribution data may be summarized or presented as a graphic in table form. For new taxa or where primary types are designated, full label data is required for type specimens. Include the names of the collections in which the specimens are deposited. We strongly recommend that primary types be deposited in institutional collections as recommended by the ICZN (1999, Recommendation 16C). Use of acronyms in Arnett et al. (1993), *Insect and Spider Collections of the World*, is strongly encouraged. Alternative acceptable acronyms are available at <http://hbs.bishopmuseum.org/codens/>.

**6.** Footnotes are prohibited. Text Notes presented at the end of the manuscript are acceptable.

**7.** Text should be kept simple. Do not use many special characters, as they frequently do not translate into the layout program, for example: male and female symbols (use M or F instead), eastern European diacritical marks, etc. Cite figures in the text as '(Fig. #)' or '(Fig. #-#)'. All figures must be cited in the text. Headings within the text are variable, see website for general style regarding bold or italicizing. Do not try to match fonts or font size, we will do that in the layout process.

All genus and species names should be spelled out in full and the author cited the first time a name is used in the text. This includes primary taxa and hosts. For hosts it is strongly recommended that additional information be given to indicate its taxonomic position: "... the plant, *Xus albus* Linnaeus..." or "... *Xus albus* Linnaeus (Asteraceae)." Abbreviate the genus name to its first letter and omit the author names after the first full use, EXCEPT in the case where the name is at the beginning of a sentence, then spell the genus name out in full. Never begin a sentence with an abbreviation.

Cite references in the text as follows: Fonzerelli (1994) or (Cunningham 2005), Laurel and Hardy (1914) or (Abbott and Costello 1943), (Washington 1798, 1801a, 1805; Jefferson 1808; Smith and Wesson 1860; Colt et al. 1945). Avoid commas between author and year, do not use ampersand 'and' for 'and'. References should be cited as 'in press' only after they have been accepted for publication.

**8. Literature Cited.** Present full citations for all references cited in the text. Include only references cited in the text. Use bold font for names of authors and year at the beginning of each entry. Use text-wrapping functions. Do not use hanging indentation because it does not translate into the layout program and is easily done by the editors. NEVER use hard returns, tabs, or spaces for every line. Names of journals and books are to be spelled out in full. When referencing books, we require publishers, cities, and total pagination be included with the reference. Cities are to be given in their English equivalent. For general organization and punctuation, see examples at the end of this article.

**9. In Figure Captions.** 'Figure' is spelled out in full, followed by the number range. Within the figure caption, each cited number is the beginning of a sentence and is boldfaced. Example:

**Figure 1-5.** Adult and larval habitus and structures of *Platyssyllus castoris* (from Desneux 1906). **1)** Adult dorsal habitus. **2)** Adult ventral habitus. **3)** Larval dorsal habitus. **4)** Adult maxilla, ventral view. **5)** Adult labium and mentum. Scale line = 0.25 mm.

**10.** Tables created in word processing programs or databases do not transfer easily into the layout programs and are not acceptable. Use of tables is generally discouraged, unless they are created and submitted as a graphic.

**11. Photos, Tables, and Artwork:** Whenever possible, illustrations should be assembled into plates. Maximum dimensions of printed artwork are: full page 6.75" x 9" (1:1.3). Please take these dimensions and proportions into account when assembling plates. Resolution of electronic images should be 300-600 dpi in the final printed size, higher for line drawings. Images with too high a resolution create massive PDF files, and will be reduced. Low resolution images cannot be improved and may require authors to submit better images before the manuscript is accepted.

Submission of original artwork is discouraged (unless it was electronically produced). Contact the managing editor if this is a problem. Any costs accrued to handle original artwork will be passed directly to the author (scanning, postage, etc.). Do not apply individual figure numbers to final images. However, please send some form of a guide so we can correctly impose numbers in the final layout for uniformity. Use scale lines where appropriate. When sending multiple image files, use clear file name(s) or clearly associate images with the figure captions. Color images are acceptable and will be used if provided.

Electronic media will not be returned, unless specifically requested. Contact the editors if there are concerns or questions.

**12. Keys.** Keep the formatting of keys simple. Do not attempt to add a string of periods leading to the end selection. Do not attempt to create hanging indentations, which will not translate into layout programs, but are easily done by the editors. For larger keys, we recommend use of parenthetic numbers indicating the previous couplet where the selection was made. Use a hyphen to lead the second part of a couplet, not a primed number (e.g. 12'). In couplets stating more than one character, use semicolons to separate statements, not periods. Bold the number or names that end each part of a couplet. For example:

23(10). Antenna lamellate; abdomen coarsely punctate laterally, lacking punctures medially . **24**

- Antenna filiform; abdomen finely punctured throughout . **25**

24(23). Pronotum black; elytra dull . ***X. nigra* Bates**

- Pronotum white; elytra glossy . ***X. alba* (Linnaeus)**

25(23). Tarsal claws absent . ***X. adigitatus* Vander**

- Tarsal claws present . **26**

**13.** Other general concerns should follow the most recent CBE Style Manual (now CBE 1994).

### Submission Requirements

**1.** Manuscripts and associated graphics must be submitted in an editable electronic form, not PDF. We have the capability to read most file formats but prefer text prepared in either Microsoft Word or Corel WordPerfect.

**2.** All submissions must include proof of 2 peer reviews; e.g. copies of letters from the reviewers with general comments, or copies of the reviewed manuscript itself. We require these reviewers be acknowledged in the manuscript.

**3.** Graphics or other images must be of an appropriate quality when submitted. They must be saved in either TIF or JPG format. If in JPG, graphics should be saved at the maximum quality setting. Graphics should never be imbedded in the same file as the main text.

**4.** Manuscripts may be submitted attached to an e-mail message (size restrictions apply for each e-mail) sent to the editor or mailed by normal post on a CD, 3.5" disc, or USB readable apparatus.

**5.** All submissions must include an e-mail address where the corresponding author may be contacted.

**6.** If any manuscript or graphic does not meet our submission requirements, the author will be notified that it is not acceptable in its current form. Suggestions will be given to improve the manuscript for a second submission.

### Acceptance and Publication

Once accepted for publication, manuscripts will be formatted and a PDF page proof provided for the author to approve or return a list of corrections. After author acceptance of the page proofs, publication should be within a month. While we anticipate this final step, from acceptance to publication, to take less than 2 months, it is limited by the time the author takes to reply. Author timeliness is critical in this final step, and may delay publication of their manuscript.

### Acknowledgments

We thank R. E. Woodruff, Florida State Collection of Arthropods, Gainesville, Florida, for his insight into publishing and obtaining necessary information leading to our electronic production. We also are grateful to J. H. Frank and T. J. Walker, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, for continued discussions regarding concerns with electronic publication. We thank all of the CSE members who responded to our questionnaire regarding the proposed change in production, and hope that our decisions will serve all in the most efficient and cost effective fashion. For reviews and detailed comments on these guidelines and procedures, we thank the CSE Board of Directors and Editorial Board, but especially J. Brambila, USDA-APHIS, Gainesville, Florida; R. D. Cave, Indian River Research Center, University of



Florida, Ft. Pierce, Florida; J. H. Frank, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida; J. Peters, Entomology Center, Florida AandM University, Tallahassee, Florida; and R. E. Woodruff, Florida State Collection of Arthropods, Gainesville, Florida. This is Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Division of Plant Industry, Entomology Contribution No. 1075.

### Literature cited

Note: These are examples of preferred presentation style, some are not cited in the text.

- Arnett, R. H., Jr., G. A. Samuelson, and G. N. Nishida. 1993.** The insect and spider collections of the world (second edition). Flora and Fauna Handbook No. 11. Sandhill Crane Press; Gainesville, FL. 310 p.
- Arnett, R. H., Jr., and R. E. Woodruff. 1998.** CSE style manual and requirements for publication in *Insecta Mundi*. *Insecta Mundi* 12: 38, 58.
- CBE [Council of Biological Editors]. 1994.** Scientific style and format: the CBE manual for authors, editors, and publishers (6<sup>th</sup> edition). Cambridge University Press; Cambridge, U.K. 825 p.
- Davis, A. C. 1934.** Notes on the insect inhabitants of wood rat houses in California. *Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences* 33: 1-13.
- ICZN [International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature]. 1999.** International code of zoological nomenclature. Fourth edition. International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature; London. 306 p.
- Skelley, P. E., and R. D. Gordon. 2002.** Family 37. Scarabaeidae. V. Subfamily Aphodiinae. p. 42-48. *In*: R. H. Arnett, Jr., M. C. Thomas, P. E. Skelley, and J. H. Frank (eds.). *American beetles*, Vol. 2. CRC Press; Boca Raton, FL. 861 p.

### Appendix.

#### What is Peer Review?

Robert E. Woodruff

Florida State Collection of Arthropods  
P.O. Box 147100, Gainesville, FL 32614-7100

**Authors are solely responsible for the content of their papers.** When an article is quoted or cited, it is the author's name and reputation at stake. The author, not the reviewer, editor, or publisher, will be criticized or commended on the contents. Authors do have the last word on reviews. However, the review process can point out weaknesses and improvements to make the final version better.

Obviously, authors would like their paper to be as accurate and complete as possible. They usually have close colleagues review the paper before submission. Constructive criticism should be welcomed by all authors. This does not suggest that first drafts should be sent for PEER REVIEW. Good reviews not only improve the paper, but the reputation of the author. Disagreements are OK, but the author takes all risks.

**What is a PEER?** According to my encyclopedia, it is "a nobleman" [rare in scientific circles]; "a person who has equal standing as another as in rank, class, or age."; "a companion; a fellow" [Archaic]. The term originates in Latin: *par*, meaning equal; through Old French *per*, meaning equal; to Middle English *peer*. We often think of it as those above us, or those who know more. In fact, it only means equal. As a result, the reviewer should not consider his position as **authority** (after all, **author** is a part of the word).

So, what is PEER REVIEW? We all want our papers to be the best, and peer review is an attempt to "get another opinion". That opinion might differ strongly, but it should be heard by the author. He must still be the judge if he is willing to modify his paper. As an example, Darwin's peers (anonymous or not) might have had serious objections to his theory of evolution, or even the way he presented it. But science would have greatly suffered if his theory had not been published!

A recent Associated Press article entitled “Online publishing a threat to peer review” (Gainesville Sun, October 2, 2006) discusses the pros and cons of peer review. Obviously the concept of peer review applies to publishing online or hard copy printing. The article indicates that the Public Library of Science (journal PloS) will launch its first non-peer reviewed journal (PloS ONE). Manuscripts will be “...posted for the world to dissect after an editor gives them a cursory look.” Some believe this may flood the Web with an unfiltered, deluge of junk science and poor quality papers. The CSE does not intend to give up the PEER REVIEW process, but we want to clarify how it is implemented within our editorial process.

Who are PEER REVIEWERS? Here we are referring to expert review of manuscripts on specialized scientific subject matter. Often there may be only 1 or 2 experts on a given subject. In most cases, the peer reviewer should be equally knowledgeable as the author on the subject matter, and as unbiased as possible. Their critique should be constructive, without personal attacks. They must be willing to sacrifice their valuable time reviewing someone else’s research, with the expectation that someone will do the same for their papers. They are not required to be great authors, but should provide a constructive review, useful to the author and editor.

The PEER REVIEW process; how does it work? As a former editor for several journals and a peer reviewer for hundreds of papers, I have found that the existing peer review process does not work very well. For most journals it involves the editor sending the submitted paper to 2 or more potential reviewers, with specific guidelines and deadlines. Often the paper has already been scheduled for a specific issue of the journal. After some bad experiences with some reviewers, the editor pares down his list of competent and dedicated reviewers. The list is often very limited, and good reviewers are asked to review even more papers. It sometimes causes good friends to avoid their editors’ requests.

The major problem with the process is time. When journals are 1 to 2 years behind, and delays on getting research published cause serious problems (e.g., synonymy), it is imperative to streamline the process. Editors may go without one or both peer reviews when printing deadlines dictate. In other cases, the author and reviewer disagree sufficiently that the editor must sit in judgment for the debate. In many cases he does not have the expertise or background to judge. Reviewers usually have ongoing research projects that may take them out of country, or prevent them from devoting the time to do a thorough job. Rarely does the process work as it is intended.

So, what can be done? For **Insecta Mundi**, the late Ross H. Arnett, Jr. and I came up with what seems to be a workable modification of the PEER REVIEW process. We wholeheartedly agreed with the necessity of such reviews. However, we believe that conscientious authors know the PEERS who can constructively review their papers. Therefore, we required authors to send their papers to 2 such reviewers and to include the reviews when submitting the paper to the editor. The Editorial Board can then determine if proper modifications were made, and to see any criticisms. This speeds up the process tremendously, because there is no waiting by the editor or mailing requests to the PEER REVIEWERS. Any peer reviews, judged by the Editorial Board, that appear the result of collusion, favoritism, or personal bias may be rejected and require further reviews. If anonymous or further review is necessary, it can still be done. We also consider our Editorial Board capable as a peer group, with expertise for providing suggestions to authors for manuscript improvements.

Because we are planning to publish **Insecta Mundi** by electronic processes, the speed and efficiency of the review process is essential. We expect to publish within weeks after papers have been accepted. Our system has functioned well over several years, and we intend to continue the requirements. We believe that this process constitutes PEER REVIEW as defined above, and thus, our journal is PEER REVIEWED. Only the mechanism for the reviews is changed, but quality papers are still assured. We require 2 peer reviews to be submitted with each manuscript!

Accepted: April 13, 2007

