

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Insecta Mundi

Center for Systematic Entomology, Gainesville,  
Florida

---

September 1995

## Book Reviews

Ross H. Arnett Jr.

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



Part of the [Entomology Commons](#)

---

Arnett, Ross H. Jr., "Book Reviews" (1995). *Insecta Mundi*. 123.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/insectamundi/123>

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.

## BOOK REVIEWS

For uniformity and as an aid to authors of book reviews, the Editorial Board of *INSECTA MUNDI* has agreed to the following as requirements for submitting reviews to the editor of the journal.

1. Copies of books for review must be obtained by the editor, either directly from the book publisher or donated from some other source (*e.g.*, purchased directly from the publisher). If someone wishes to review a book that has been received as a review copy from a publisher, the author and title of the book must be sent to the editor in advance of writing the review. The editor will then approve or reject the proposal. (*This is done to prevent "book collectors" from writing to publishers requesting review copies in the name of "Insecta Mundi." We have notified many publishers not to honor such requests.*)
2. The editor will write to a qualified person with the request that a review be prepared, with the understanding that the review may be accepted or rejected by the editor. If accepted, the review copy of the book may be retained, if desired, by the reviewer. If the review is rejected, the copy must be returned for use by another reviewer. The editor will set a deadline for the return of the review. If this cannot be met, the proposed reviewer should ask for an extension, or the book returned.
3. A review should contain the following elements:

In general, the review should state why the book was written, followed by a brief description of the contents of the book (usually the contents will be summarized rather than giving a complete list of the chapters or sections).

This is followed by a discussion of how well the author(s) of the book have met the stated purpose of preparing the book. This is an expert evaluation, not a simple statement of the reviewer's "gut" feeling. This appraisal should include a discussion of the adequacy of the illustrations, the format of the data presented, and the overall presentation in either printed format or electronic presentation.

Above all, as an expert in the subject matter, the reviewer should discuss the accuracy of the statements made in the book.

Finally, the reviewer should evaluate the contribution of the book's contents to the current state of the field covered.

4. The following is abstracted from the guidelines provided by AAAS and AIBS, somewhat modified:

Keep these suggestions in mind as you read; this way you will have something to work toward as you read and make notes. Keep in mind the things you look for in a book which you might purchase. *Do NOT list titles of chapters, their authors, papers, number of illustrations and/or references.* These can easily be summarized. *Do NOT be afraid to criticize a book or parts of a book which you feel are inadequate.* If you cannot judge a book with an unbiased evaluation of the subject matter, you probably are not the one to review the book. Intelligent comparisons and analogies are always excellent review techniques. *Take your time when reading a book and writing its review in order to eliminate careless misjudgments and rash statements.* A poor review will only be rejected. This would be wasted time and effort on your part and ours. If you need more review time, ask for it. Do not make it necessary to followup the missed deadline with letter after letter. *Refrain from editorializing.* The book is the object in question, as well as its merit. *Personal viewpoints on the given subject are for authored writings not book reviews.*

For the Editorial Board

By Ross H. Arnett, Jr., Editor, *protem*