

[Print Page](#) | [Close Window](#)

12) Publication forum

Printed from: ISSLR Forums

Topic URL: http://www.isslr.org/forums/topic.asp?TOPIC_ID=198

Printed on: 03 Sep 2014

Topic:

Topic author: rjellison

Subject: 12) Publication forum

Posted on: 27 Jan 2008 09:49:33

Message:

No decision has been made as to the publication forum for papers from the GSL2008 meeting. Also, no editor has been chosen and thus this task is unassigned. We have had considerable discussion on this issue in the past and it is probably useful for you to review this in topics 9 and 15 of last year's board meeting before commenting here.

There appear to be 3 viable options at present: Hydrobiologia, Saline Systems, and SIL's new journal. There are pros and cons to each of these and here I only mention new considerations (please review past discussion).

Hydrobiologia:

The editorial policies of Hydrobiologia have changed and are less favorable to our needs. It is not known what difficulties Jacob John has had and to what extent they are willing to publish GSL2008 proceedings.

Saline Systems:

Saline Systems is still a viable option although it has enjoyed limited success at attracting a large number of manuscripts (browse to www.salinesystems.org) and cost is a major drawback.

Following last year's meeting Shil DasSarma provided the following advantages:

- 1) Articles are Open Access and therefore are permanently available to anyone with an internet access anywhere in the world.
- 2) Article access statistics are maintained on the journal website(www.salinesystems.org), with papers that are "Highly accessed" indicated by the publisher.
- 3) Article processing charges (APCs, currently J400, £590, US\$780) are waived for papers where there would be a submitting member institution author, or at the discretion of the editors, or APCs are discounted for submitting authors from supporting member institutions.
- 4) There are no page limits, color figures, supplementary materials, and multimedia displays are permitted and encouraged.
- 5) All common software packages are accepted for submitting materials, including EndNote, although none are required.
- 6) The BMC electronic review system allows an usual turnover time from submission to publication is about 6 weeks.
- 7) Papers are published within a few days of acceptance and final professional formatting is usually completed within a few weeks.
- 8) Papers are immediately PubMed and Chem Abstract Selects (CAS) abstracted and deposited in PubMed Central permanently.
- 9) Complete articles are also permanently available (and cited) through Google Scholar, and 6 other international mirror sites
- 10) Authors retain copyright and may print and distribute publications at their discretion.

I would add that there would be no problem with the appropriateness of content and that there are a ready supply of reviewers -- 14 members of ISSLR are on its editorial board.

SIL's New Journal:

I think a new journal by SIL is an excellent forum. However, I know nothing about it at this point. There is nothing on SIL's web site. Javier is a member of SIL's publication committee so I'm hoping he will provide us an update here.

Replies:

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 10:05:12

Message:

Saline Systems has increased the handling fee to 440 Pounds. I have the strong impression that this fee is too high for most colleagues. The number of papers published last year was very low: just FIVE papers only + one editorial.

Aharon

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 10:11:45

Message:

Another issue with Saline Systems (of which I happen to be an editor myself): my experience as a paper author for the journal does not confirm the statement that "The BMC electronic review system allows an usual turnover time from submission to publication is about 6 weeks." My second paper for the journal was in review for about 5 months, and my third and last submission (for the proceedings of the Colchester meeting) was sent in more than two months ago and I still have not heard anything from the editor who handles the paper, so in my experience the journal is actually much SLOWER than other journals.

Aharon

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 12:02:08

Message:

Interesting experience Aharon. I find the up front fees for Saline Systems excessive and I don't like the style. But I am willing to give it a go for this conference, in the absence of anything better (e.g. the old Hydrobiologia). The new SIL journal is its formation months/year and hence an unknown and it is probably not wise for them to have as part of their early issue a specialised conference proceedings. There is Aquatic Ecology which I don't think as been adequately explored.

Another problem with the upcoming conference proceedings, is the papers will fall into two groups ---'pure' science on Tuesday and Wednesday and applied matters on Thursday and Friday. This may require two different outlets. Also it is possible some of the subject areas may want their own outlet; I think of the waterbirds on salt lakes session. Also for once in our societies' experience we may have lots of papers being submitted, maybe as many as the first volume way back in the first conference in 1979.

In view of all these unknowns and against my better judgement, I propose for this conference we go the Saline Systems route. Someone has to stick their nose out, and I have just done it! It is not perfect option, but we will not know its problems until we try it. If it doesn't pan out well, then next time we could try an established SIL journal or a Hydrobiologia that has come to its senses.

Brian

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 15:45:12

Message:

If Saline Systems is to be used then a group decision is needed only if the intent is to actually produce a physical volume with its own title page, preface, table of contents. Otherwise people can just submit individually, perhaps with a little label saying something like "Publication from such and such conference" on the first page.

If a volume is intended, only then do we need to select an editor. And we also need to nail down deadlines, costs, format, type of cover, etc.

I suspect the few remaining unpublished Salton Sea projects from my group we will try to publish in Lake and Reservoir Management, as that journal gives very good service based on my current experience and as almost any studies done on that lake have potential management or restoration implications.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 16:27:35

Message:

In response to the long times Aharon experienced I looked at the time from submission to publication of the last ten articles in Saline Systems and it was 69 days.

I think a larger issue might be that the journal is not attracting very many papers and thus its longevity and indexing by ISI and others is somewhat uncertain. Of course, 20-30 papers from the last conference would have been a great boost to the journal and 20 from this one may also be enough to get it established.

Reply author: adegermendzhy

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 19:02:38

Message:

We can consider also Aquatic ecology.

People who visited Shira conference should remember Ramesh Gulati - the editor of the journal, and I as the member of editorial board of the journal can assist with promotion of ISSLR proceedings but as far as I know after getting IF the journal is more popular and we should probably wait sometime if will request special volume just now.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 19:41:15

Message:

Aquatic Ecology is a viable option. They are less likely to publish physical/chemical papers but certainly remember the Shira Lake volume. It is a well-established journal and I see several salt lake researchers on its editorial board.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 20:30:22

Message:

Another option for publication of at least a portion of the papers is to let the individual Special Session organizers choose their own journal for publication. We have not, however, advised them of this "responsibility" or "opportunity", but some might find it attractive. This option is consistent with Brian's comment that we are going to have a considerable range of papers ranging from basic to applied, and hopefully, ecological to biogeochemical to management.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 20:31:58

Message:

Maybe we want to think about a book with the meeting proceedings, independent of a journal. That is what we did with the halophile microbe meeting in Ljubljana in 2004, we have a nice 573-page book published by Springer. I have good connections with the editor of that book series ("Cellular origin, life in extreme habitats and astrobiology"), and I happen to have a meeting with him tomorrow. I can bring up the idea, if it may sound attractive.

Aharon

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 27 Jan 2008 23:43:22

Message:

I suggest we authorize Aharon to talk to the Springer's editor of their special series.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 28 Jan 2008 02:29:24

Message:

Some more information about the book we published after the Ljubljana halophile conference September 2004:

You can find more information on the 575 page, 34 chapter book at:

<http://www.springer.com/life+sci/microbiology/book/978-1-4020-3632-3>

It was produced in camera-ready format, we did it quickly and it was on the shelf less than a year after the meeting (including peer review and revision, where necessary!). We gave clear proof that it is possible, even with over 30 authors, to produce a quality volume in a short time.

The list price of the book is currently Euro 165. To help us convincing Springer to publish the volume for us, we at the time agreed to place a bulk order for 40 copies, if I remember well (this was handled by my Slovenian colleagues) at Euro 90 per copy, and these discounted copies were then sold to authors (no free copies for authors!) and other interested colleagues. Not a simple operation - shipping and handling take a lot of time, and one or two persons who received copies still have not paid us yet. But still, this price is far less than the 440 Pounds that authors will have to pay for the privilege to see their manuscript online in Saline Systems. If one or more of the Salt Lake City meeting sponsors are interested in sponsoring publication of such a book, that may also help!!

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 28 Jan 2008 07:53:41

Message:

Is a Springer book like this indexed by the major citation services (e.g. Web of Science)?

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 28 Jan 2008 08:06:57

Message:

I don't think so, but I will check tomorrow.

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 28 Jan 2008 13:36:20

Message:

Other questions re the Springer possibility:

- does Springer reserve right to overrule decisions of guest editor?
 - ms length limitations?
 - any charge for color plates?
 - does Springer provide authors with pdf's of their articles?
-

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 28 Jan 2008 21:11:50

Message:

Replies to Stuart's queries:

- does Springer reserve right to overrule decisions of guest editor?

No - the book editor submits a camera-ready copy of the complete manuscript.

- ms length limitations?

No, but the contract with Springer has some information about the approximate number of pages of the entire book. The Gunde-Cimerman et al. Ljubljana volume had 575 pages and 35 chapters; we had one 23-page chapter. Note that the print is quite small so that the amount of information per page is limited.

- any charge for color plates?

Yes, color plates have to be paid for, and the Ljubljana volume actually contained a color plate paid by the authors of the chapter.

- does Springer provide authors with pdf's of their articles?

Not that I know, but this can possibly be negotiated. As the submission of the chapters is in camera-ready form, the authors have automatically a copy of their chapter as it appears in the book (only the page numbers are missing). However, as copyright will be transferred to Springer, authors are probably not entitled to freely distribute their document.

Reply author: adegermendzhy

Replied on: 29 Jan 2008 02:30:09

Message:

This year one scientist from our Institute publish a chapter in Springler book and was provided with pdf of his chapter. Moreover the whole book is available in pdf at Springer web-site and if you have access (we have) yo can download the whole volume.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 29 Jan 2008 05:49:52

Message:

I had a very productive meeting with Dr. Joseph Seckbach, the editor of the Springer book series. He appears to like the idea, and I supplied him with the 2nd announcement of the Salt Lake City meeting as well as with the abstract book of the Perth meeting so that he can get an idea of the scientific content and scope of our meetings. He will contact Springer soon, and if the publisher will like the idea as well, we will have to produce a document describing the book, scope, etc. I have requested to speed up the process, so that if approved, potential authors can be notified in April, manuscript be ready in August-September, and be reviewed, revised, and formatted in camera-ready format by December. I have done this kind of work before for the Ljubljana book, and here I know it can be done (when I can be a realist, no need to be a

pessimist).

Dr. Seckbach told me that in the last volumes in production in the series, 16 color pages could be included at no extra cost.

I will keep the board updated.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 29 Jan 2008 09:59:37

Message:

Aharon you have done well and it seems we could be on a go-er here. I am available to be a quick reviewer.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 29 Jan 2008 10:48:37

Message:

I will do my best.

Reply author: jalcoer

Replied on: 29 Jan 2008 14:10:01

Message:

Another possibility is "Limnologica", an indexed (web of science, 2006 impact factor: 0.722) Elsevier journal. Of course it would be necessary to talk to the editor (Rainer Koschel) regarding the scope of the journal (see below) considering the wider scope of our proceedings.

Limnologica publishes original contributions, news, and reviews dealing with any aspects of ecology and hydrobiology of inland waters and adjacent biotopes. Also discussions and essays that develop limnological-ecological theory are published (including all qualitative and quantitative aspects of planktonic, periphytic, benthonic, neustonic, and nektonic organisms, nutrient and energy flow, bioindication, biomonitoring, water-internal control mechanisms, ecological modeling and simulation, biological-ecotechnological water quality and fisheries management, protection of water and restoration). Publishing articles on theoretical and basic questions, Limnologica is dedicated to the protection and restoration of inland waters and therefore also covers practical themes.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 29 Jan 2008 14:29:08

Message:

Javier, I see your on the SIL Committee for publications. Can you update us on the status of their new journal?

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 06:56:36

Message:

The board has a tendency to discuss items and then let them drop. We need to make some decision on this. It would be advantageous to have a decision made prior to the conference, but that may not be possible. Who is in charge of making sure this discussion moves ahead and a decision is made. I nominate, Aharon. He's already done some work on this and is certainly one of the most experienced editors among us.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 07:18:15

Message:

OK. I will take responsibility for this issue. I am now looking forward to hearing from Springer, but that can take a few weeks.

If Javier has more information about the SIL journal I would like to be updated, of course. Note that I myself am not a member of SIL.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 12:39:54

Message:

Thankyou Aharon for accepting the task. In case a seconder is needed for the records, I second Bob's proposal.

Brian

Reply author: jalcocer

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 13:07:50

Message:

The SIL committee is still analyzing the different propositions. The response time of the different editorial houses seems to be quite large. We are still waiting for the answers of two editorials. As soon as something arises, I will let you know.

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 18:19:06

Message:

Springer sounds like it might be a good option. But a few more questions/comments:

- a large page size, e.g. like Hydrobiologia, is desirable as it gives more flexibility for large and/or complex tables and figures; is this an option?
 - if authors must provide camera ready copy. that implies they are responsible for all details of format, placement and sizing etc. of tables and figures - that may be more than some authors can/want to handle. Editor may end with more work than in the past. Alot more work than with just straight text mss.
 - would all authors, not just senior authors, get a copy of the volume.
 - recommend that Springer be asked to provide a high quality pdf of each article
 - if no free copies provided and if price is ca. 165 euros (= ca. USD \$250), this might be the biggest negative of this option.
-

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 22:42:12

Message:

A few replies to Stuart: The price of a book is in any case far less than the 440 British Pounds charged by Saline Systems for each paper.

It is clear that, if free copies will be available for authors (which was not the case for the Ljubljana volume), then only one author per chapter will receive a copy.

About the camera-ready format and formatting of manuscripts, don't worry about that - I have done that before with two such volumes, one I authored myself and for the second one (the Ljubljana book) I was one of the editors. It is simple, a template and instructions will be supplied

to authors, and I and/or the series editor will do the rest.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 31 Jan 2008 22:49:55

Message:

Some good news: the series editor Dr. Joseph Seckbach forwarded me the following reply from Springer:

"I spoke yesterday with Springer and brought up the option to compile a new volume out of the conference in SLC on Salty Lakes. The reply was positive and they wish to have all the relevant information. So I attach the Preliminary Book Information [PBI] empty Form for you to write in all relevant information you will have during the coming months."

The PBI form looks as follows:

PRELIMINARY BOOK INFORMATION FORM

Date:

Author/Editor(s):

Address:

E-mail:

Telephone:

Fax:

Title of work:

Subtitle:

Expected submission date:

Estimated number of pages:

Type of work: Level:

monograph new material undergraduate level

edited volume previously published material graduate level

conference proceedings invited papers only

text book other: _____

Estimated number of:

(a) Line drawings:

(b) Tables:

(c) Photographs (colour)

(B&W)

(d) Other items

Will your book be a translation?

yes, original language:

no

If your work will be a translation do you hold the copyright of the original publication?

Yes No

If the copyright is held by another party, please indicate who this party is:

Do you think that language editing will be necessary? Yes No

The manuscript will contain:

Preface

Bibliography of selected titles

Name and/or subject index

- Translator's note
 - Introduction, by
 - Glossary of term
 - Other items
-

Description and purpose of the work:

Please attach also the following documents:

- „X a 1-2 page summary of the book's main themes, arguments and objectives
 - „X a table of contents along with the names of each chapter author where applicable
 - „X a short paragraph outlining the content of each chapter
 - „X your curriculum vitae with a list of your publications
- Additional information about the work such as relevant off prints, a specimen chapter, etc. should also be supplied.

Could you give names of 4 other experts in this particular field?

Suggestions:

- a.
- b.
- c.
- d.

Primary audience for the work:

Competitive titles: please list below those books with which your work will compete:

In what way does this book differ from those titles mentioned above?

Is there additional use for your book as a course book?

Yes No

If your book could be used in coursework, please list possible courses: (include course title/type, level, possible enrolments, main text, supplemental reading, and possible contacts giving the course)

Can you list the scientific societies, the members of which would be most interested to receive information about this project?

- a.
- b.
- c.
- d.

Are there particular organizations who might be interested in ordering multiple copies of your work?

Yes No

If so, please list details:

Would you be able to organize a pre-publication bulk-order? (whereby multiple copies of the book are ordered before it is published, which makes the book available at a substantial discount)

O Yes O No

The review process takes approximately 3 months. If you have any queries regarding your project or regarding the review process in general please do not hesitate to contact us.

Thank you for considering our company as the publisher of your work.

Kind regards,
Melanie van Overbeek
Agronomy- Life Sciences Unit

Note that the people in charge reside in Dordrecht, the Netherlands, and I speak their language!

I will start working on the form, and if I need help, I will let you know. I will of course show the completed draft to the board for comments and approval before submission. In the mean time I will try to check with Dr. Seckbach whether corresponding authors will receive a free copy of the book or will have to pay for their copies at a reduced rate, and try to get a copy of the format of the contract to be signed with Springer so that we will know what our rights and duties will be.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh
Replied on: 01 Feb 2008 00:04:12
Message:

One thing to keep in mind for both the book format possibility and especially for a single-volume journal, is that we expect perhaps twice as many people at this meeting as in previous conferences (ca. 200). It could be that we're overly-optimistic, but the response has been high, and there are a lot of active research and management issues in the local Great Basin that will attract a lot of participants.

If half of the people who present go on and produce a manuscript, we could be talking about a book with 100 chapters, or the complete inability of a single journal volume to handle the contributions.

We need to keep this possibility (likelihood?) in mind when talking with editors.

Reply author: btimms
Replied on: 01 Feb 2008 00:07:01
Message:

Looks good to me, especially in our circumstances

Reply author: aoren
Replied on: 01 Feb 2008 00:10:40
Message:

Wayne, how many lectures will be have? Will there be parallel sessions?

In any case, 600 pages will be a reasonable maximum for a book, which means up to 50 chapters

if we will limit chapter size to 10 pages camera-ready (which is not very little, taking into account the small type; if anyone is intested in sample pages I can provide those). But also no journal will want to cope with such a number of papers; special issues of journals generally contain up to 15-20 papers at most. With Saline Systems there is of course no limit, but there the problem is, who is going to pay for it?

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 01 Feb 2008 00:15:31

Message:

We must be getting ready to taking a formal vote on this.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 01 Feb 2008 00:19:26

Message:

A formal vote, that means on the question whether or not to submit a formal proposal to Springer. Submission of a proposal still does not guarantee that we will indeed be invited to produce a book.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 01 Feb 2008 00:22:16

Message:

Yes Aharon to vote on whether or not we submit a formal proposal to Springer. It is a step in the publication process.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 02 Feb 2008 17:12:59

Message:

The editor associated with Springer (J. Seckbach), also contacted me after conferring with Aharon. Although he seems enthusiastic he has said he is interested in the "possibility to publish the proceeding of the SLC conference as a new volume in Cellular Origins, Life in Extreme Habitats and Astrobiology series". I explained that the papers generated by the meeting would be much more diverse than that, but his 2nd communication with me didn't say anything about broadening the scope of the publication.

Aharon, do you know if he understands how diverse the papers could be?

Once scenario is to let the organizers of Special Sessions choose an outlet of their choosing for their papers. For example, the papers from Aharon's special session on microbial ecology would fit well in the book Seckbach is talking about.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 02 Feb 2008 20:35:01

Message:

My idea is that the book should represent the contents of the meeting and salt lakes in general, not only a few selected sessions on specific topics. That is how we should present the case to Springer, hoping that they will accept the idea. If not, we should look for other frameworks. It is clear that there should be a selection (by invitation from the volume editors only) of who will be invited to write chapters, as there is no way to accommodate 200 papers in such a volume.

If it is felt that every speaker (and poster presentation as well?) should be given the opportunity to write for the proceedings, then the Springer book is not a good idea, and other frameworks should be sought.

If indeed we want to submit a proposal to Springer, we have to get it ready within 1-2 weeks, as the decision procedure at Springer takes up to 3 months, and we need to announce the need for manuscripts no later than the conference itself, preferably earlier than that. But before I can submit a document to Springer, I need a mandate from the board to do so.

Wayne, would you be willing to be co-editor of the book, if indeed we will go for that option? Or do you have another suitable candidate among the local team?

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 02 Feb 2008 21:20:10

Message:

Ah, for the simple life.

For our Salton Sea symposium, we had 250 attendees, 51 presentations, 30 ms submissions, and 24 mss acceptances. I worked with every author who was willing to get their ms in shape, with very detailed suggestions and editing on my part, often thru 2+ revisions. There were no rejections only withdrawals or "I don't have time."

I suggest a two-volume solution if we think we'll end up with 30+ ms:

1) vol. 1, the Springer production - but make sure they understand these won't be "chapters" really or restricted to a narrow theme, as they have suggested so far; papers for this volume would include mainly those focused on basic limnology, ecology, physiology, etc.

2) vol. 2, a special issue of Lake and Reservoir Management - this could be for papers more oriented to management, conservation, lake problems, etc. Scientific quality of these papers should be as high as for the Springer volume. Sometimes takes more work to push folks working on management issues to that level. I have developed a great relshp with present Editor in Chief, Jim LaBounty, would be willing to ask him about this - think he'd be enthusiastic if he had confidence in the volume editors.

Another issue: the idea of selecting contributors a priori on the basis of something other than a reviewed ms sounds counterproductive - unless of course the idea is to give us old farts priority. That would be fine!

Another issue: A serious problem is that because of shortage of space relative to submitting authors, so many journals are now accepting only LPUs - or asking you not only to put your large data sets in an online archive, but half your methods and discussion sections as well!

I suggest that acceptable length of a ms cannot be evaluated independently of its substance, and we shouldn't set arbitrary length limits. If these truly were "chapters", it would be otherwise. But some published papers at 5 pp are too long, some at 20 pp are too short. No need to focus on anything except quality.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 02 Feb 2008 21:29:32

Message:

So far, Stuart's suggestion seems like the most viable alternative to handle the diversity of papers a ISSLR/FOGSL meeting will generate. As mentioned, probably a lot of the management-oriented folks will not want to push their papers through a publication process. Consequently, my previous estimate of "papers" might have been too high. On the other hand, there still might be more management papers than Lake and Reservoir Management can handle.

I will not be able to be an editor for the proceedings.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 03 Feb 2008 00:03:57

Message:

Great to be led by two experienced editors in this discussion. Wayne if you do not want to be involved with the editorial process, is there anybody on your team who is suitable? I ask as it is only right and proper and in keeping with our tradition/rules (thanks for reminder on this Stu --- though I must say it is not working with ISLC9), that somebody in your team is very much involved, unless there is a good reason for this not to be so. There could be too much work for Aharon, so that Stu may need to be involved (e.g. management volume). What is important is that we have possibilities in place; final decisions may need to be at ISLCX.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 03 Feb 2008 00:07:21

Message:

As I said before we need a vote from the board to give Aharon authority to place a formal proposal to Springer. Are we ready to vote?

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 03 Feb 2008 06:06:30

Message:

Brian, there's a possibility that Dave Naftz could be the co-editor. He's a geochemist who is on our planning team and who's now very involved with contaminant issues in the Great Salt Lake. He's with the US Geological Survey. Most of his publications are on things other than saline lakes (ice cores; selenium contamination in wetlands, groundwater contamination), but I don't think that's a problem. He's the best organized person on our planning team and a real pleasure to work with. Do you want me to ask him, or perhaps Brian should.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 03 Feb 2008 06:10:48

Message:

Brian, yes, let's vote. I say yes. I'm not necessarily convinced yet that Springer's interested in a broad volume (even if we put management stuff in a journal volume), we may still have papers that won't fit in a biological/ecological volume (e.g. salt chemistry, physical mixing in salt lakes, dust from dry salars, etc.). However, we won't really know Springer's stance until we give them a proposal.

Reply author: sarosj

Replied on: 03 Feb 2008 07:40:44

Message:

I agree with Wayne- that issue needs to be resolved clearly before we proceed with the Springer option, and the proposal should presumably let us clarify it. I would support the proposal to explore this option-

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 05 Feb 2008 00:16:20

Message:

Wayne, as conference organiser I think it is your role to provide a co-editor if it is possible. From what you say it does seem possible. Further, this is a NOT formal position of the board, so I think it is an ad-hoc arrangement between the editor and yourself. By the way the editor is not officially voted in yet---the nominating committee has not met yet and besides if it had met the positions don't change till the end of this year ---all a bit messy/ rather presumptuous on my part and Aharon's). But we still need an authorisation for Aharon as our representative to make a

formal approach to Springer in order to get the ball rolling. So more votes please.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 05 Feb 2008 01:00:19

Message:

We further need a clear statement whether a Springer book, if approved by the publisher, will be the only framework for publication of the proceedings or whether part of the proceedings should be published elsewhere (and if so - where?). It is clear that a book with up to about 40 chapters can only be based on invited chapters, and if indeed we will have over 200 presentations in Salt Lake City this means that only a small part of the proceedings can be in the Springer book. Then the next question is, if the intention is to have more than one framework for publication, will each framework be reserved for specific sub-disciplines or should a book be as broad as possible to present the current status of the discipline? These are questions that should be clarified before a proposal to Springer can be submitted.

I have on my shelf that nice volume entitled: "Great Salt Lake - an overview of change", edited by J. Wallace Gwynn, and published by the Utah Geological Survey, with over 50 chapters on nearly 600 pages. Would the Utah Geological Survey or another GSL-associated body be interested in a book covering different aspects of GSL and other salt lakes, based on the presentations at the meeting?

Reply author: jalcocer

Replied on: 05 Feb 2008 07:35:44

Message:

In my personal perspective, a book with diverse themes coming from diverse lakes without connection except by the fact all of them deal with inland saline waters will be of no interest for the general public (the potential consumers) and consequently for the editorial house. I guess it is hard to believe buying a book when just a small percentage of it is of direct interest. In the other hand, I guess it will be more attractive for the potential contributors to publish a formal paper in a SCI journal than a book chapter; book chapters are not consider equivalent to a regular paper in most academic committees. In addition, proceeding papers are not seen equivalent as formal journal papers. Besides this problem, I suggest diversification. I assume a large portion of the papers will deal with the GSL, and then these would be more appropriate for a book (Utah Geological Survey?). If another group of papers would be more or less oriented to a single theme, then it could be proposed as a thematic book to Springer. Finally, probably half or one third of the papers could be handle in one or more journals as special issues arranged by themes. In this way, it is probable to deal with such a large number of contributions. Of course, it poses a huge amount of work for the editors. By the way, Wayne how do we know the approximate number of potential submissions? Is the abstract submission site available yet?

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 05 Feb 2008 10:44:39

Message:

You pose a hard question Aharon, because we do not yet know the variety of papers to be presented at GSL. Nor do we know the standard. Javier has a point that the possible Springer book should be themed to attract buyers and not a hotch potch of papers; one such theme would surely be on GSL itself. The special sessions should add a few others. I might add that some authors will refrain from publishing in a book because of its lack of an impact factor. So an oversupply of papers may not be a problem. I think I would suggest Aharon that you present a proposal with a number of themes on salt lakes plus the plenary papers. This means that miscellaneous papers, no matter how good, will miss out. So be it. Any other suggestions?

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 05 Feb 2008 12:06:13

Message:

When we were having trouble with Hydrobiologia for our Salton Sea volume, I spoke with an editor at Univ. Calif. Press who was quite interested in the possibility of putting out our papers as a book. HOWEVER, he made clear that the articles (all in final form) would have to be modified to appear as "chapters". That is, sexier titles, some reformatting, not too data heavy, etc. So I considered that option no further. Is this what Springer would want too?

Am I correct in assuming there is no interest in looking into Lake and Reservoir Management?

As a society, rather than a commercial, journal, costs, reprint arrangements, etc. are likely to be better with such a journal than with a commercial one. Their issues are normally about 100 (large)printed pages (= ca. 250 ms pages), but they're doing a 200 page issue on the Salton Sea right now, and probably would be willing to do a 300 page one, if their extra costs were covered, as we are doing. They are however focused on applied issues, not basic science unrelated to such. So that suggests, again, a two volume solution, involving Springer if they're game.

I note that two salt lake researchers (Mike Anderson at UCR, and Chris Holdren at USBR) on the LRM editorial board and probably would support an issue from the SLC meeting.

Once a decision is made on publication venues, it might be desirable to organize talks at the meeting so that those in any given session are destined (by organizers and editors) for a specific volume. Don't think that choice should be left to contributors - could lead to mild chaos. Would want to have separate editors for each volume. (And, no, I'm not angling for an editorship; will still be in recovery from doing two Salton Sea volumes over last three years!)

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 05 Feb 2008 14:44:06

Message:

To answer one question of Javier. Abstract and Registration for the meeting just opened yesterday, and the site still isn't complete or readily available (<http://www.isslr.org/GSL2008/in/default.aspx>). Consequently, the optimistic numbers of people attending and that will present papers is based mostly on gut feelings from talking with people. The late availability of the website will, however, surely hurt us some with regards to registration. Not knowing the number of potential participants is unnerving, to say the least.

With regards to publication here are two emails that I've sent out regarding potential outlets:

1) To Martyn Caldwell, NSF Ecosystems Division, previously faculty member in my college.

Martyn;

The International Soc. for Salt Lake Research (ISSLR) and FRIENDS of Great Salt Lake will be putting on a conference in Salt Lake City in May. The web site for this is still under construction, but all of the pieces are there if you want to see what it is about (<http://www.isslr.org/GSL2008/in/default.aspx>).

The Board of ISSLR is currently considering what outlet(s) should be used to publish papers from the meeting. We're guessing there might be 150 oral and poster presentations . Some will be basic research, others will be applied, and many will concern Great Basin lakes, and especially the Great Salt Lake. I expect that many of the papers will be from management people who may be less inclined to push their papers through to publication.

You approached me several years ago about editing a new book on the Great Salt Lake for Springer's Ecological Studies series. As far as I know that hasn't come into being. Are you still editing this series, and if so, would you be interested in a diverse set of papers on saline lakes? One of the problems/strengths of the meeting is that it is very diverse, with papers ranging from

salt precipitation chemistry, to food webs, to management. Another Springer editor , J. Seckbach, also contacted me about publishing "the proceeding of the SLC conference as a new volume in Cellular Origins, Life in Extreme Habitats and Astrobiology series". Our Board will likely contact him regarding publishing at least a part of the papers. However, we're uncertain whether he is interested in a broad spectrum of papers on saline lakes. The Ecological Studies Series might come closer to covering the scope of papers from the conference.

2) To Wally Gwynn, editor of a book on the Great Salt Lake who's currently with the Utah Geological Survey

Wally;

As you likely know, the Int. Soc. for Salt Lake Research (ISSLR) and FRIENDS of Great Salt Lake will be putting on a conference in May. The web site for this is still under construction, but all of the pieces are there if you want to see what it is about

(<http://www.isslr.org/GSL2008/in/default.aspx>). I've also attached the 2nd circular.

The Board of ISSLR is currently considering what outlet(s) should be used to publish papers from the meeting. We're guessing there might be 150 oral and poster presentations . Some will be basic research, others will be applied, and many will concern Great Basin lakes, and especially the Great Salt Lake.

Your book on the Great Salt Lake came up in our discussions, and the Board was wondering if the publishers of your book might be interested in a new book on saline lakes. My copy of your book is missing from my shelf (grrrr...), so I can't find the editor. Who did you deal with for your book? Do you think they might be interested in a proposal from us?

Hope to see you at the meeting.

Wayne

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 06 Feb 2008 08:29:25

Message:

I received the following reply from Wally Gwynn--they are not interested in publishing our proceedings:

Wayne,

Having discussed your question with the proper individuals regarding the Survey's interest in publishing a volume from the upcoming ISSLR conference , it was decided that we are not in a position to do that. If, when the proceedings do come out however, we may be interested in carrying copies in our book store.

Wally

J. Wallace Gwynn Ph.D.
Utah Geological Survey

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 07 Feb 2008 09:33:49

Message:

I received the message below from Martyn Caldwell, an editor for Springer's Ecological Studies series. Let me know if you want me to proceed, or whether we should just wait until we hear from the editor of Springers microbial series.

From Martyn Caldwell, NSF.....

Wayne,

In principle, the idea of a book on the Great Salt Lake would be strongly encouraged. Gary Belovsky had agreed to do this earlier when it appeared that you were not in a position to undertake it. However, as you can imagine, Gary's plate is rather full and I don't know if he has made much progress, or not. I simply haven't heard. Obviously, I don't want to encourage a book that would interfere or compete with Gary's if indeed he is going to do something. Also, from the sound of what you have in mind, I don't think it would mesh so well with Gary's approach. If you wish, I will try to find out the status on his book.

From your description, what you have in mind could possibly fit the Ecological Studies (ES) format, but it would likely take a great deal of work on your part, especially for the more applied contributions. There is certainly nothing wrong with applied topics, but substantive contributions with good standards would be expected. I am sure you could take some or all of these and, working with the authors, get them into shape to meet these expectations, if you want to invest the time in it. (ES would not be interested in publishing simply a collection of posters, and various tidbits.) I can easily imagine a very good book could result from a nicely refined collection. I don't think the breadth of coverage would be a problem ---- it could be very interesting. Many of the ES books so result from meetings or large projects.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 07 Feb 2008 21:06:09

Message:

The new option that Wayne suggested looks promising as well, and I don't think anyone of us will be deterred by the amount of work involved (at least - I myself am not!).

Concerning the Springer - COLE series book that I suggested earlier, note that nothing has yet been submitted to Springer, as I have not yet received the mandate from the board to do so. I also cannot prepare the formal proposal to Springer as long as it is not clear whether the book should contain representative (and invited - selected) papers that cover the whole congress or specific topics only, etc., also in view of the fact that the idea of dedicated journal volumes etc. is still being explored.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 08 Feb 2008 23:51:39

Message:

Aharon, after a couple of weeks of a rather busy board meeting, it seems most of us have taken time off and not logging on to see what is going on. I have asked for votes to support your formal approach to Springer and suggested that you go to them with a specialist proposal using most, if not all, of the special topics and of course with a section on GSL. I have counted 2 votes and there is mine if a casting vote is needed, but we need more. There may be enough good applied papers for Lakes and Reservoir Management, though we don't seem to have a volunteer to edit it. So this is unresolved, but at least you can get a start on the more academic side if we can get a few more votes.

I myself will be away soon in the un-internetted Outback for about 2 weeks, so please colleagues I want to get this one through before I disappear.

Reply author: mcoleman

Replied on: 09 Feb 2008 04:36:15

Message:

I have been reading the posts but find myself unqualified to comment. I pass my vote to Brian. Can I do that or do I abstain :)?

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 09 Feb 2008 04:38:58

Message:

To my opinion, to abstain would be best in such a case.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 09 Feb 2008 08:56:25

Message:

Aron , you have my vote to go ahead. I said so earlier, but it was buried in a long message, and might have been missed.

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 09 Feb 2008 11:25:09

Message:

The mandate to Aaron is in Brian's words,

"a specialist proposal using most, if not all, of the special topics and of course with a section on GSL."

But Brian has said "it is not clear whether the book should contain representative (and invited - selected) papers that cover the whole congress or specific topics only, etc.,"

So I'm not sure we have a clear motion. Perhaps THE FIRST ISSUE TO DECIDE is whether all presenters at the symposium will be invited to submit manuscripts for publication in one or more proceedings volumes, with the usual proviso that the usual standards (e.g. L&O, Ecology, Hydrobiologia, etc.) for quality of the science and writing will be used in judging acceptability AND with the editor and organizers having the right to solicit special, possibly, review papers from particular individuals. (Review papers can, of course, take up a lot of space.

Therefore I move the above ("...all presenters at the symposium will be invited to submit manuscripts for publication in one or more proceedings volumes..."). This has been the practice for all past conferences, as most of you know.

If this passes, then the next issue to be decided would be what TWO venues should we try to use for the proceedings, on the assumption that the number of publishable papers to be submitted would exceed the capacity for any one.

If it does not pass, the next issue would seem then to be, what mechanism do we wish to employ to decide which presenters will be invited, and which not invited, to submit manuscripts? POTENTIAL ATTENDEES NEED TO BE ADVISED OF ANY DEPARTURE FROM OUR TRADITIONAL RECEPTIVENESS TO MSS FROM ALL PRESENTERS WELL IN ADVANCE OF REGISTRATION DEADLINES.

So, who will second my motion?

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 09 Feb 2008 12:40:17

Message:

Two comments on Stu's motion. First, before we can go forward with this, we would need to have two people step forward to be editors, and at present we have none.

Secondly, the registration process has already begun, and given delays in hearing back from potential editors, it is unlikely that we can clearly define the publication scenario before quite a few people have registered. I tried to get discussions going on the publication issue since SIL back in August, because I realized that we should have this cleared up before registration started. Unfortunately, we just haven't accomplished this yet.

At this point, perhaps the website should at least advise people that "Decisions as to whether and where papers will be published are still forthcoming". It doesn't sound good, but at least it

would advise people that publishing their paper as part of a proceedings isn't a given.

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 09 Feb 2008 13:12:19

Message:

Wayne's points are well taken, but it seems to me we must first decide the question I moved.

Aaron at least has agreed to be an editor. Having more than one on a given volume can, in my experience, actually slow the process. So we do not need a second editor unless my motion is passed. There is no reason to assume a priori that a good one couldn't be found....

But we need to "get off the dime" and make this decision!

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 09 Feb 2008 21:36:17

Message:

I fully agree with Stewart that we need clarification about all the points raised before a decision can be made. One volume or more than one? One or more special issues of journals as well? If one book, there will be a maximum size, and that means that we cannot accommodate 200 papers. There should be a consensus about the procedure to be followed (chapters by invitation only?).

I am perfectly willing to help and use part of my time to work on the publication of proceedings, but clear guidelines are needed. Furthermore, if I will proceed exploring the Springer - COLE option, the proposal evaluation by the publisher should take 2-3 months, to if we need to make an announcement at the meeting, there is no time for further delays. But I will start working on a formal proposal to Springer only after the board has given clear instructions about the framework(s) of publication, scope of each volume if more than one book/journal issue is to be devoted to the proceedings, and policy of inviting authors (all paper authors or selected authors by invitation).

On another issue, if one of the advantages of 'Saline Systems' was supposed to be the rapid handling of manuscript: I still have not heard from my editor about the paper I submitted on November 12 last year!!!! After nearly three months I am still waiting to see the reviewers' comments.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 10 Feb 2008 13:13:50

Message:

It seems the publishing issue is the most vexed one facing our society and the GSL conference. I think the best option to take to Springer is a specialist volume with defined sections, NOT an allcomer wide-ranging array of papers. Sure this means some good papers will miss out. But maybe their authors would prefer a journal with an impact factor anyway. So I do not support Stu's motion at the moment, but if mine lapses and Aharon has NOTHING to take to Springer, then I will vote for it, as to have his proposal carried is far better than none at all. Unfortunately I now leave for many days away with only the rare chance for internet access.

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 10 Feb 2008 15:28:53

Message:

Looks like some folks are dozing off!

If there is no second to, let alone a majority vote in favor of, my motion, then we have made a de facto decision that mss will be accepted on an "invitation only" basis. That fact should be

made clear to registrants and also put on the conference website immediately. Further details can be put up as we decide them.

Let's fish or cut bait here, ladies and gentlemen!

My guess is that we'd get less than 50 mss that would survive rigorous peer review, if we opened up the proceedings to all registrants. Editors of past meetings (e.g. China meeting, Russia meeting) have had to "pad" the proceedings volumes with papers (several from my group!) that were not even presented at the meetings! In other words, the more common problem has been too few mss to fill out a full Hydrobiologia volume!

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 10 Feb 2008 16:03:35

Message:

Stu, in principal I agree that your two-volume approach is a good one, but I don't agree that we can move in that direction unless we have an editor for the management-related volume (NA J of Lake Management). It would be bad to put the two-volume scenario in the Conference Web Page, and then back off later if we don't have an editor.

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 10 Feb 2008 17:35:26

Message:

Wayne, I agree completely. Nothing that is not completely settled by the board should go on the website.

But until the board agrees that all presenters should be allowed to submit ms, there is no point in even worrying about what would be the second venue and who would be a second editor.

So the generalized silence suggests that 1) the majority favor the "invitation only" option and 2) no one wants to propose a mechanism/committee to "cull the wannabe's"! (Excuse American idiom: that means "to eliminate a priori the contributions of those presenters to be excluded from the proceedings volume".)

In reaction to problems with the Perth volume, I think we made a mistake in saying that the board - not the organizer - should take the lead in saying who would edit the proceedings. Things are a bit more complicated now that we've given up Hydrobiologia, but in the past at the same time the conference was being organized, the lead organizer got a firm commitment from the Hydrobiologia Editor-in-Chief that they would 1) publish the proceedings, and 2) do so under the editorship of whomever was putting forward the proposal (or that person and others nominated by him, as when Mianping asked Bill Williams and myself to help edit the Beijing proceedings).

We should go back to that arrangement: a key responsibility for the the lead organizer for each conference is to make, well in advance, whatever arrangements are needed for publication of the proceedings. They need to demonstrate to the relevant publisher the value of the project and their own competence to do the job. That should "go with the territory." Sorry we took you off that hook!

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 10 Feb 2008 17:52:17

Message:

Stu;

I originally assumed the editorship would be my responsibility, but when I raised that issue at an informal "board" meeting at SIL, I was told that it was the responsibility of the Board to choose the editor and the publisher. I've continued to raise the point 2-3 times since August, but only recently has the discussion got any traction. I'm now reluctant to step up for this, because my

research program is in a very bad state at present due to some unanticipated departures from my lab, and because of all of the time I've been putting in to get the conference going.

I emailed Dave Naftz to see if he might be interested in editing the applied volume (without committing ISSLR to him). I haven't heard back.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh
Replied on: 18 Feb 2008 10:48:14
Message:

There are two more pieces of information on the publication issue.

First, Dave Naftz, one of the conferences organizers, has expressed interest in editing a volume, particularly if he can bring in a co-editor.

Secondly, we now have an option for publishing the proceedings in a gray-literature publication of my College. Here is the text of an email from the editor of that series:

=====

Hello Wayne,

I have been putting together the series Natural Resources and Environmental Issues for some time. Here is a link <http://www.cnr.usu.edu/quinney/htm/publications/nrei>. I think this conference would fit nicely into this series. I can provide all the non-content editing and the formatting with the NREI budget then the only cost would be for the printing, binding, and distributing.

Let me know.

Patsy

=====

These reports are distributed to approximately 40 other natural resources libraries. They are also fully Google-searchable. For others she has done, the cost to authors who want a copy of the volume is \$20+shipping. She is willing to put up \$1,500 for putting this together. She thinks she will recover that cost by selling volumes to other libraries. When we did the budget for the conference we did not include any money for editing and publication, since I'd been told that that was now the Board's responsibility.

This publication would definitely be gray literature, and thus not be a tremendous "resume builder" for contributors. We could do a SIL-type publication, with people choosing either to submit just a 1-page extended abstract (or their regular abstract), with others opting to submit a full paper. Patsy says that she would not object if people submitted their papers in full to this proceedings, and then also submitted it to a peer-reviewed journal. HOWEVER, she has had people run into difficulty from journal editors, who feel that this is double publication.

One option would be to do this publication and then also go with the Springer volume that Aron is investigating.

There is currently nothing in the Conference web page advising people whether there will be any publications from the meeting, and it certainly would be good to resolve this soon.

Consequently, I move that:

1. We publish the papers/extending abstracts from the conference in the Natural Resources and Environmental Issues series if Dave Naftz will agree to edit it, and;
2. that we authorize Aron to talk with Springer about a book. I don't believe this was ever approved.

Reply author: btimms
Replied on: 18 Feb 2008 11:44:53

Message:

I support both of Wayne's proposals

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 18 Feb 2008 14:53:09

Message:

The series Wayne recommends is attractively produced and it is nice not to have to use a magnifying glass for a change! But here are some issues:

- with the format, type size, etc. used in previous issues, the 900 pp of ms from our 25 contributors to the Salton Sea symposium would have converted to 600-650 published pages for an issue in this series. Would that be a problem? You could get MORE than 900 ms pages of mss!
 - this raises the question again as to whether all good ms submitted (other than those for a Springer volume) would, with adequate revision, be accepted?
 - some scientists will be reluctant to publish their better, bona fide scientific papers in a volume that is going to be a mixture of abstracts (extended or not) and papers. Whatever the venue, I suggest excluding stand alone abstracts.
 - reprint costs, pdfs, color plates....? all the usual details needed in a proposal.
 - on the Springer option, Aaron should, I imagine, be able to talk with Springer without our authorization and come up with a concrete, detailed proposal for board consideration.
-

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 18 Feb 2008 21:18:47

Message:

Having followed all the recent postings on the topic, my thoughts and conclusions are now as follows:

1. The framework of Natural Resources and Environmental Issues appears very suitable to the topic of the meeting.
2. Publication is cheap and authors will be able to buy a copy for a small charge only; a Springer book will (at the reduced rate) cost about Euro 100 or more. This will make the Natural Resources and Environmental Issues option attractive to authors.
3. I am sure that we will be able to do a good (and quick!) job with reviewing, editing etc. so that the scientific quality of the book will be more than adequate.
4. If I will have to 'sell' the idea of a book to Springer, I will have to come up with a proposal for a well-focused book, and that will not be very easy in view of the diversity of topics dealt with at the meeting. With a proceedings volume in the series Natural Resources and Environmental Issues we will not have such a problem.
5. For a Springer book, copyright has to be transferred by the authors to Springer. Therefore contributors to the Springer book will probably not be able to have their chapters published in both frameworks. I doubt that authors will be willing to spend their time to producing two sufficiently different chapters so that we can fill two volumes.
6. Publication of two volumes based on the same congress will necessarily make each book "incomplete", unless each volume will be strictly focused on one theme that does not overlap the theme of the second book. In that case the choice to which framework to submit a paper will not be with the authors but with the editors.
7. The Springer option needs time for the writing of a proposal and its reviewing by Springer. The

reviewing process normally takes about three months. This means that, if approved, we can make an announcement and send out invitations to write chapters only very shortly before the meeting - in the best case. On the other hand, invitations for chapters, including instructions about length, format etc. for a book in the Natural Resources and Environmental Issues series can be sent out already now. If we do this, then we can easily request submission of the papers at the time of the meeting (and maybe extending the deadline to the end of June for "slow" authors), get the process of reviewing and editing on the way, and have a pile of accepted papers ready to be sent off to the publisher by October-November (a realistic, not overly optimistic prognosis from your vice-president who in many other issues tends to have pessimistic views).

8. Approval of the (yet-to-be-written) proposal by Springer is by no means sure.

9. I therefore suggest to stick to one framework, and I currently would prefer the Natural Resources and Environmental Issues option.

10. I would love to be involved in the production of such a volume and use my earlier experience as editor of three multi-author books (for Kluwer, Springer, and Elsevier/Academic Press) to ensure both rapid processing of the papers and a good scientific quality.

11. Greetings from a white Jerusalem - we are getting snowed in today for the second time this winter - quite an unusual phenomenon.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 19 Feb 2008 01:54:54

Message:

Sounds good. I will leave you two to sort something it, as I go bush again after being held up for days by a flooded river. Snow would be refreshing in this 30+deg heat.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 19 Feb 2008 19:47:16

Message:

Patsy Palacios, the editor of the Natural Resources and Environmental Issues (NREI) series provided the following additional information about the publication. She will soon provide us information on the printing costs. I cut and pasted this from a PDF, so some of the formatting is not so good.

ISSLR

NREI / QUINNEY LIBRARY PROPOSAL

The publisher of Natural Resources and Environmental Issues (NREI) recognizes it's role in educating natural resources leaders who can then provide the guidance needed to increase the production of the earth's renewable resources while sustaining/enhancing the global environment. This publication, first published in 1993, is a monographic series that addresses relevant current topics. The journal is published in a series of volumes, each addressing a single topic and often associated with an organized symposium. Publication in NREI is by invitation only. Each NREI volume sells for \$20 (\$25 international).

We will inspect your abstract/paper for non-content editing such as fixing spelling/grammar mistakes throughout with special attention to title, footnote, heading etc. errors for complete volume consistency. We will then send you a revamped copy. Once you're happy with the format, we will compile everything together and create a contents page, index section, and a screen ready pdf. We can even handle the distribution of the printed publication.

Option 1: We will format your manuscript and supply you with a high quality, printer-ready PDF. Your PDF will be supplied free of charge as part of the overall package. With this option symposium abstracts/papers will be published within the NREI series. This options includes a

page limit of 300 with minimal charges for pages beyond.

Option 2: We will, in addition to option 1, distribute the proceedings to a number of Universities and publishers world wide (See list of exchanges and standing orders at bottom). The basic distribution package will be made available to buyers on the Quinney Library (College of Natural Resources, Utah State University) website at www.quinneylibrary.usu.edu. Individual authors will not receive royalties for the sale of this publication. If your manuscript contains images, tables, or color elements, we will offer both a black & white and a color copy option with relevant pricing.

Authors Rights

When we edit, format and compile your work we act as a guide only and not take any credit for the work. All work remains in your name and copyright to you.

Copy Right

The work that you send to us should be work that you have created yourself for the purpose of this symposium. Original composition of the abstract will be accepted for the purpose of this publication while the paper in it's entirety can appear in a scientific publication for a chance to expose the same work to a wider audience.

Data Protection

We keep a record of all our clients and their work for a period of 18 months for the sole purpose of future development. We will never give out personal or work details to any other person, organization or agency.

Our Policy

We offer a service and so what you're paying for is our time. We will at no point offer a refund should you not like any work that we carry out. We will however try to fix any problems without further charge.

NREI EXCHANGE / INDEXING SERVICE / STANDING ORDERS:

Aristotle University of Thessalonika, Greece
Blackwell's Book Service, New Jersey
BLM, Idaho Office
CAB International, United Kingdom
Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, Maryland
Colorado Division of Wildlife
Congressional Information Service, Maryland
Illinois Natural History Survey
Institute for Ornithology, MME Budapest, Hungary
Institute for Scientific Information, Pennsylvania
Instituto Nacional de Investigacion, Madrid
InterDok, New York
Istitute Sperimentals Per La Selvicolutra, Italy
Japanese Forestry Society, Japan
Ministerio da Agricultura, Do Abastecimento e da Reforma, Colombo, PR
National Serials Data Program, Washington D.C.
Nebraska Game and Park Commission
New Mexico State University
NISC Colorado
North Carolina State University
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
Senckenbergische Bibliothek, Zeitschriftenabteilung, Germany
Taiwan Forestry Research Institute, Taiwan
Tall Timbers Research Station
Teton Science School, Wyoming
The Book House, MI
Thorne Ecological Institute
University of Florida
University of Minnesota

University of Washington
University of Wisconsin
University of Zagreb, Croatia
USDA Forest Service Technical Information Specialist, Ohio
USDA National Agriculture Library, Maryland
Yale School of Forestry, CT
Yankee Book Peddler, New Hampshire

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 20 Feb 2008 08:57:07

Message:

According to Patsy's new info, there is for each issue "a page limit of 300 with minimal charges for pages beyond."

It is important for all board members giving input here to actually examine issues of the NREI series that are online, to understand the implications of the single column, large font format used. See: <http://www.cnr.usu.edu/quinney/htm/publications/nrei>.

Wayne, can you ask Patsy about costs and feasibility if the actual number of PUBLISHED pages were to be, as I think probable, in the range of 600-1000?

Here's another NEW-OLD issue. IF selection of the proceedings editor is to be a board decision [Perth was the first time that was the case], the candidate editors should submit to the board a very condensed CV that documents their qualifications (publn record, previous editorial experience, etc.) to serve as editor. We have a good sense of Aaron's capabilities in this regard already, but I at least know nothing of Dave Naft's qualifications.

Can you ask him to submit a short CV as suggested above?

As I recall, I made a similar suggestion during preparations for the Perth conference but the board demurred.....

We should consider going back to the "old way" where it was the explicit responsibility of conference organizers to decide who would be editors and to have worked out, by the time of their submission of a proposal, the DETAILS of publication arrangements. It worked well in the past.....

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 20 Feb 2008 09:04:18

Message:

A few relevant items from my CV:

Editorial work:

1994-present Editor - FEMS Microbiology Letters
1991-1999 Member of the editorial board - International Journal for Salt Lake Research
1998-present Associate editor of a book series - Cellular Origin and Life in Extreme Habitats - Kluwer Academic Publishers / Springer
1999-present Associate member - Bergey's Manual Trust
2001- present Member of the editorial board - Extremophiles
2001- present Associate editor - International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology
2004-present Member of the Editorial Review Board of Archaea
2005-present Managing Editor - Saline Systems
2006-present Member of the editorial advisory board - microbiology section - Encyclopedia of Life Sciences (John Wiley & Sons)

BOOKS

1. Oren, A. 1987. Bacteria and viruses. 139 pp. The Amos De-Shalit Science Teaching Centre in Israel.(textbook for high school students, in Hebrew, has also been translated into Arabic)
2. Oren, A. 1987. Bacteria and other microorganisms - laboratory manual (in Hebrew - manual for high school students). 116 pp. The Amos De-Shalit Science Teaching Centre in Israel.
3. Oren, A. 1996. Metabolic diversity in the bacterial world: the biogeochemical cycles. Academon Press, Jerusalem, 97 pp. (in Hebrew)
4. Oren, A. (ed.) 1999. Microbiology and biogeochemistry of hypersaline environments. CRC Press, Boca Raton. 359 pp.
5. Oren, A. 2002. Halophilic microorganisms and their environments. Kluwer Scientific Publishers, Dordrecht. Book. 575 + xxi pp.
6. Nevo, E., Oren, A., and Wasser, S.P. (eds.). 2003. Fungal life in the Dead Sea. A.R.G. Gantner Verlag, Ruggell, 361 pp.
7. Gunde-Cimerman, N., Oren, A, and Plemenitaљ, A. (eds.). 2005. Adaptation to life at high salt concentrations in Archaea, Bacteria, and Eukarya. Springer, Dordrecht, 576 pp.
8. Gunde-Cimerman, N., Oren, A., and Plemenitaљ, A. 2005. Mikrosafari – #268;udoviti svet mikroorganizmov solin - The beautiful world of microorganisms in the salterns. Bilingual Slovenian/English publication. Drřavna Zalořba Slovenije, Ljubljana, 160 pp.
9. Rainey, F.A., and Oren, A. (eds.) 2006. Extremophiles - Methods in Microbiology Vol. 35. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, 821 pp.

Research papers, book chapters etc.: > 300

Reply author: jalcocer

Replied on: 20 Feb 2008 18:32:29

Message:

I still see huge problems. Aaron's book will necessary be very selective (one research field) so a bunch of papers will not have the opportunity to be considered in this publication of "higher quality". So, the remaining papers would only find a place in NREI, a "lower quality" publication. NREI will necessary display a large diversity of themes of dissimilar scientific quality.

I am sure one of the most important "hooks" to the conference is the possibility of publishing a paper in a good scientific journal. I am afraid until now our publication offer is not attractive enough for potential authors to submit good scientific papers in a gray journal, as Stu mentioned; few researchers have >300 papers like Aaron for not been concerned about the fate of their papers and their CV's.

Have we already discarded the idea of sorting the papers for considering different journals (different special issues corresponding to the major scientific fields?)

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 20 Feb 2008 18:58:37

Message:

Keep in mind that people are not obligated to publish in the gray journal. If they have a good paper they can put it in Hydrobiologia, Science, or any journal of their choice. They would still have the option of putting an extended abstract in the gray journal. Consequently, I don't see why publishing a journal volume from the meeting is all that attractive to the individual author (it does make a nice offering to the science community). ASLO has great meetings and they don't

attempt to publish anything other than a book of abstracts.

A MAJOR issue we have to deal with, is that we are essentially out of time. We should have had this discussion 4-6 months ago, but we didn't. It is conceivable that we could get 2-3 journals to publish volumes, but we certainly wouldn't know that for several months, and hence people will have committed (or not) to the conference without any knowledge of what is possible.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 24 Feb 2008 21:00:42

Message:

It is high time to vote on the issue of publication of the meeting proceedings. Speakers / prospective authors will have to know about publication well in advance if indeed we want to produce the proceedings quickly. In that case ready manuscripts should be brought to the meeting and we will be able to start processing them without delay.

All options are still open:

- A volume in the series "Natural Resources and Environmental Issues". Advantages: we will be able to accommodate many papers; the volume can be bought for relatively little money. Disadvantage: not well represented in databases etc.
- A volume for Springer. Advantage: good quality publication. Still relatively inexpensive if we place a bulk order for a large number of copies. Disadvantages: we will not be able to accommodate all contributions - also because of space limitation (600 pages is about the maximum), and to have a focused volume we may also have to be selective about the topics of the chapters. A formal proposal for such a book should still be submitted to Springer and the decision will be after 2-3 months; approval is by no means certain.
- Saline Systems: very expensive at 440 pounds per manuscript. By the way - I am still waiting for the reviews of that paper that I submitted on November 12, so: SLOW, SLOW (but here a guest editor may be able to speed things up. I predict that the percentage of papers to be rejected will be high, unless the guest editor will have complete autonomy concerning acceptance of papers.
- Hydrobiologia or any other journal.
- A combination of one or more of the above options.

Whatever option we will choose, we will have to make a decision quickly so that invitations to prepare chapters can be sent out.

Bob, are you willing to start a formal voting procedure?

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 29 Feb 2008 21:26:25

Message:

Nobody has yet reacted since I posted the last message on the topic of proceedings publication. It is not clear to me what happened to this electronic board meeting that started so well with lively discussions on key issues and has now almost died without any decisions made.

I now propose a vote on the following proposal, which reflects my personal preference with respect to publication of a proceedings volume for the Salt Lake City congress:

"The Board recommends the publication of a proceedings volume of the Saline Lakes meeting in Salt Lake City 2008 in the series "Natural Resources and Environmental Issues". Submission of papers is voluntary. Papers should be submitted at the time of the meeting and in any case no later than June 30, 2008. Responsibility for the scientific quality, the reviewing process, and

technical matters will be with the editor to be elected to the new Board during the general assembly of ISSLR members to be held during the Salt Lake City meeting; the appointment of a local co-editor from Utah is to be recommended. The editor(s) should forward the final manuscript to the publisher no later than October 31 2008".

Are we ready to vote on this?

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 02 Mar 2008 03:23:10

Message:

I agree with Aron that publishing in the Natural Resource outlet is the best option given how late we are in dealing with this. Authors have the option of not submitting (or just publishing an abstract). Dave Naftz, the US Geological Survey geoscientist in Salt Lake City, has agreed to be co-editor, and he agrees that the Natural Resources outlet would be the best option (but he's open to other, higher-profile outlets). I could be 3rd co-editor, but due to my research commitments, wouldn't be able to do much until mid-summer. Editorship could be decided latter, but I think it would be better to decide on this prior to the May meeting.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 02 Mar 2008 04:09:05

Message:

So, Bob, can we start a formal vote?

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 03 Mar 2008 01:20:52

Message:

I am back in civilization. I am happy to support Aharon's suggestion of publishing in the Natural Resources and Environmental Issues format, though really it is my second option as I think a Springer volume would have been better for many authors. Certainly considering the late hour, we must stop talking and opt for the quick, cheap all inclusive way, i.e. Aharon's present suggestion. (And yes I am disappointed too as the drop off in keenness in discussion after we started so well ---I guess some of us, including me, have distractions when the 'meeting' continues on and on).

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 03 Mar 2008 01:22:51

Message:

So, where are the other members of the board and why don't they participate in the discussions?

Reply author: mcoleman

Replied on: 03 Mar 2008 02:50:55

Message:

dear members I am here but as I mentioned I dont feel qulaified to vote

Reply author: sarosj

Replied on: 03 Mar 2008 04:02:05

Message:

I support the proposal, but would like to note that I hope the book approach is viewed as a trial, in that we'll see how successful it is with this meeting and then re-evaluate whether to pursue a book again or go back to a journal format. I understand all of the problems associated with the journal format, but that being said, it's certainly higher profile and more desirable for more

authors than a book. In this case, however, with the level of interest about the GSL, I think a book could turn out to be a great option.-Jasmine

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 03 Mar 2008 04:12:09

Message:

Of course a journal is to be preferred. However, the question is, what journal! Hydrobiologia, the old framework in which proceedings of previous meetings were published, has become almost impossible now, as the experience of the past two meetings has shown. Concerning Saline Systems, I don't expect that many authors are willing to pay 440 UK Pounds to see their papers published there. If you know an alternative, please let us know!

Reply author: sarosj

Replied on: 03 Mar 2008 06:15:20

Message:

I'm well aware of the problems, which is the only reason why I'm supporting the book option this time. I think it would be a good idea to discuss at the board meeting in SLC what we really see as the purpose for the conference proceedings- to attract more members, to serve as an outlet for material that may be valuable for other salt lake scientists but isn't necessarily of broader interest or of high quality, etc. This might help us to pin down where our efforts should be focused.

Reply author: jalcocer

Replied on: 03 Mar 2008 07:36:42

Message:

I totally agree with Brian's opinion. I also support the idea of having already a publication "arrangement" (Natural Resources and Environmental Issues) and keep on the discussion regarding other alternatives (book, journals); we don't have to wait until the board meeting in the SLC, we could simply continue our discussion in this way. We must keep in mind that the proceedings are of great importance to the Society since this is probably the best way to track the ISSLR activity.

Reply author: rjellison

Replied on: 03 Mar 2008 08:54:17

Message:

Apologies -- I've been out of email contact this past week. It's obvious this is a difficult question and I could comment on many replies. As you know, I have favored Saline Systems all along but recognize the lack of support among this board. Aharon's "Call to vote" and the various replies are somewhat confusing as no clear motion is before us. I think we need a clear motion and suggest the following. We should also select an editor and give them the authority to arrange all the details. For clarity's sake, let's address that in a second motion. From the previous discussion a nay vote most likely means the Springer book alternative would be considered.

RESOLVED papers arising from ISSLR X be published in Natural Resources and Environmental Issues.

If this is seconded, I vote in favor.

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 03 Mar 2008 09:05:36

Message:

There are too many cooks in the kitchen!

So I abstain, preferring that Wayne, Aaron and Dave carpe diem, seize the reins, and TELL US and registrants, in detail, what the arrangements (venue, costs, format, limitations, etc.) will be.

That worked, more or less, for 30 years; it should work now.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 04 Mar 2008 06:49:43

Message:

It was clearly stated many months ago that the conference organizers are no longer in charge of the publication, even though it had functioned that way for years. Consequently, the Board does have to make the decision.

I second and vote in favor of the Natural Resources publication. Note, however, that if this is passed, it does not really preclude someone else going forward with a subset of focused papers in another outlet and/or people choosing to publish their papers where ever they wish.

I suggest we amend the motion to include giving authors the option to publish 1-page extended abstracts in the style of the former Verhandlungen publication of SIL

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 04 Mar 2008 06:54:05

Message:

Here is the proposal for the Natural Resources pub. I believe it was posted earlier. Sorry about the bad formatting in this forum. If you want, email me and I'll send the pdf

WW

ISSLR

NREI / QUINNEY LIBRARY PROPOSAL

The publisher of Natural Resources and Environmental Issues (NREI) recognizes it's role in educating natural resources leaders who can then provide the guidance needed to increase the production of the earth's renewable resources while sustaining/enhancing the global environment. This publication, first published in 1993, is a monographic series that addresses relevant current topics. The journal is published in a series of volumes, each addressing a single topic and often associated with an organized symposium. Publication in NREI is by invitation only. Each NREI volume sells for \$20 (\$25 international).

We will inspect your abstract/paper for non-content editing such as fixing spelling/grammar mistakes throughout with special attention to title, footnote, heading etc. errors for complete volume consistency. We will then send you a revamped copy. Once you're happy with the format, we will compile everything together and create a contents page, index section, and a screen ready pdf. We can even handle the distribution of the printed publication.

Option 1: We will format your manuscript and supply you with a high quality, printer-ready PDF. Your PDF will be supplied free of charge as part of the overall package. With this option symposium abstracts/papers will be published within the NREI series. This options includes a page limit of 300 with minimal charges for pages beyond.

Option 2: We will, in addition to option 1, distribute the proceedings to a number of Universities and publishers world wide (See list of exchanges and standing orders at bottom). The basic distribution package will be made available to buyers on the Quinney Library (College of Natural Resources, Utah State University) website at www.quinneylibrary.usu.edu. Individual authors will not receive royalties for the sale of this publication. If your manuscript contains images, tables, or color elements, we will offer both a black & white and a color copy option with relevant pricing.

Authors Rights

When we edit, format and compile your work we act as a guide only and not take any credit for the work. All work remains in your name and copyright to you.

Copy Right

The work that you send to us should be work that you have created yourself for the purpose of this symposium. Original composition of the abstract will be accepted for the purpose of this publication while the paper in it's entirety can appear in a scientific publication for a chance to expose the same work to a wider audience.

Data Protection

We keep a record of all our clients and their work for a period of 18 months for the sole purpose of future development. We will never give out personal or work details to any other person, organization or agency.

Our Policy

We offer a service and so what you're paying for is our time. We will at no point offer a refund should you not like any work that we carry out. We will however try to fix any problems without further charge.

NREI EXCHANGE / INDEXING SERVICE / STANDING ORDERS:

Aristotle University of Thessalonika, Greece

Blackwell's Book Service, New Jersey

BLM, Idaho Office

CAB International, United Kingdom

Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, Maryland

Colorado Division of Wildlife

Congressional Information Service, Maryland

Illinois Natural History Survey

Institute for Ornithology, MME Budapest, Hungary

Institute for Scientific Information, Pennsylvania

Instituto Nacional de Investigacion, Madrid

InterDok, New York

Istitute Sperimentals Per La Selvicolutra, Italy

Japanese Forestry Society, Japan

Ministerio da Agricultura, Do Abastecimento e da Reforma, Colombo, PR

National Serials Data Program, Washington D.C.

Nebraska Game and Park Commission

New Mexico State University

NISC Colorado

North Carolina State University

Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation

Senckenbergische Bibliothek, Zeitschriftenabteilung, Germany

Taiwan Forestry Research Institute, Taiwan

Tall Timbers Research Station

Teton Science School, Wyoming

The Book House, MI

Thorne Ecological Institute

University of Florida

University of Minnesota

University of Washington

University of Wisconsin

University of Zagreb, Croatia

USDA Forest Service Technical Information Specialist, Ohio

USDA National Agriculture Library, Maryland

Yale School of Forestry, CT

Yankee Book Peddler, New Hampshire

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 07 Mar 2008 21:18:01

Message:

Apparently we are again stuck on this issue. Wayne, maybe you can draft a formal proposal to the board for a vote, so that the organizing committee can proceed and make an announcement to the meeting participants and potential authors?

Reply author: wurtsbaugh
Replied on: 08 Mar 2008 08:24:15
Message:

Bob made a motion to publish the proceedings in the Utah State Natural Resources proceedings and I seconded that motion. Please vote.

Reply author: sarosj
Replied on: 08 Mar 2008 08:59:10
Message:

I vote yes- Jasmine

Reply author: aoren
Replied on: 08 Mar 2008 09:05:25
Message:

In favor as well.

Reply author: btimms
Replied on: 08 Mar 2008 11:47:39
Message:

And me too.

Reply author: jalcocer
Replied on: 08 Mar 2008 23:01:51
Message:

I am in favor. javier

Reply author: rjellison
Replied on: 10 Mar 2008 13:56:54
Message:

As I said earlier I vote in favor, too.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh
Replied on: 10 Mar 2008 14:32:48
Message:

Bob, how many votes in favor do we need. Looks like we have 6 yes, and 0 no so far.

Reply author: rjellison
Replied on: 10 Mar 2008 15:57:44
Message:

A simple majority of those present. There are 11 board members and I believe all have checked in at one time or another so 6 constitutes a majority. You can consider it passed, although that is usually the function of the president to declare it so.

Reply author: aoren
Replied on: 10 Mar 2008 21:41:17
Message:

Congratulations. I trust that Brian will formally announce that the proposal was approved.

Wayne, I think you should now prepare draft guidelines for prospective authors, including information on length, format, and - most important - deadlines! It may be nice to show the draft to the board, although formally that will probably not be necessary, as it will be mainly the responsibility of the editors of the volume - yet to be appointed. Then the relevant information should be posted on the congress web site.

Reply author: mcoleman
Replied on: 11 Mar 2008 04:10:55
Message:

Wow I have heard of child births that were easier, congratulations! I have just ventured form the bush to see the entire process.

Reply author: Zhengmianping
Replied on: 11 Mar 2008 05:09:27
Message:

I am in favor too.

Reply author: btimms
Replied on: 13 Mar 2008 04:34:26
Message:

I have been away for a few days showing the countryside to Professor Ted Hammer, well known in former years. I am extremely glad to see the motion has passed in my absence(I announce its success to the world just in case we have not noticed). On the other hand I am very very frustrated by the present official editor, one Jacob John, who has not responded to my attempts to contact him over the last two weeks, despite it being teaching time at University and I know his courses are ON at present. I am not aware that he has submitted ISSLR9 mss to Hydrobiologia; if he had I am sure he would have told me. Grrrrrrr!

Reply author: aoren
Replied on: 13 Mar 2008 04:45:06
Message:

Keep trying to get hold of Jacob!

Reply author: shurlbert
Replied on: 13 Mar 2008 17:30:08
Message:

I am not involved in anyway in the Perth volume, but I'd suggest Brian contact Hydrobiologia Editor-in-Chief Koen Martens directly and ask him for his perspective on the status of the volume. Don't even both to copy Johns....he obviously has considerable disdain for his authors.

Martens email is Koen.Martens@naturalsciences.be

Reply author: aoren
Replied on: 13 Mar 2008 22:13:11
Message:

An excellent idea. The next step may be to contact all authors who have contributed papers and have received a note of acceptance from John, get the final version of the papers directly from the authors, and forward these to the chief editor.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 15 Mar 2008 17:50:53

Message:

Success? Jacob has been in the field with students. He says the mss will be submitted within a couple of weeks. I can assure the board I will be in contact with him again then and will continue to hassle him. Unfortunately he has not told me who all the individual authors are so I am unable to contact them privately. I have told him the Board is not happy with the delays, but this seems like water on a duck's back to him.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 15 Mar 2008 21:41:09

Message:

Brian, I think you should contact Koen Martens without delay and explain the situation to him, so that at least he knows what is going on.

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 19 Mar 2008 20:54:53

Message:

I second Aaron's suggestion, Brian. You could also ask Jacob to send you a copy of the table of contents. If he hasn't yet composed that, ask that he take 20 minutes out of his busy life and do so. After all he says your his co-editor.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 19 Mar 2008 22:40:43

Message:

I have emailed Koen and got a courteous reply. I shall ask Jacob yet again for a table of contents.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 19 Mar 2008 22:45:51

Message:

HERE IS THE INFORMATION THAT'S NOW POSTED ON THE 2008 CONFERENCE WEBSITE REGARDING PUBLICATION

Proceedings Publication

Natural Resources and Environmental Issues

Presenters will have the option of submitting their paper for publication in the on-line book series, Natural Resources and Environmental Issues, published by Utah State University (<http://www.cnr.usu.edu/quinney/html/publications/nrei>). This publication is fully accessible by internet search engines such as Google and Alta Vista. Color figures are acceptable. Hard-bound copies will be available for purchase.

In order to be considered for publication, you should bring a completed manuscript to the meeting in both hard-copy and on a CD disk. The copy on disk should have text in MS Word and figures in PDF format. You may also choose to publish only a 1-page extended abstract of your work which may include one figure. Manuscripts will be sent out for peer review to determine acceptability.

Reply author: jalcoer

Replied on: 25 Mar 2008 23:03:32

Message:

Wayne, I think it would be a good idea to provide extra time for manuscripts submission. I am not thinking in more than the end of May or early June considering we are announcing the proceedings publication possibility almost at the end of March leaving 5 weeks to get the manuscript ready. In addition, while on the conference you could receive new points of view, tips or additional information to improve the paper. I have the idea that in one of your previous messages you have already thought in extending the date for manuscript submission. But just an idea.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 25 Mar 2008 23:07:21

Message:

Extending deadlines already now is the best recipe for further delays. My suggestion: keep the deadline now as it is, and see how many manuscripts will be submitted during the meeting. Then, if necessary, allow the latecomers 3-4 more weeks or so.

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 26 Mar 2008 06:32:51

Message:

An intermediate scenario would be to require a draft manuscript to be turned in at the meeting, thereby forcing people to get going, but allowing them more time to polish it. I think we would get more manuscripts that way. We are dreadfully late in announcing this--in fact, most people probably haven't yet found it on the web site and won't know about it until we get notifications out latter this week.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 13 Jun 2008 22:17:43

Message:

You will all remember that the proceedings of the 2005 ISSLR symposium in Perth still have not been published. At the time Jacob John was appointed by the general assembly of the ISSLR as guest editor of a special issue of Hydrobiologia. Manuscripts have been submitted to him (Jacob never disclosed how many), have been reviewed, and at least some authors have received letters of acceptance. The manuscripts have never been forwarded to the Hydrobiologia publication office for further handling. Brian Timms has many times tried to obtain information from Jacob about the fate of the manuscripts, but in spite of many promises (including a message from Jacob stating that the manuscripts had already been sent to the chief editor of the journal a few months ago) nothing has happened yet. Jacob also did never disclose how many manuscripts have been accepted by him and who the authors are.

Following our discussions on the issue during the plenary meeting of the ISSLR members in Salt Lake City, our earlier discussions on the Board Forum in the past years, and my recent correspondence with President Brian Timms and with Secretary/Treasurer Bob Jellison, I now propose the following to the Board:

1. The Board should thank Jacob John for his contribution for hosting the Perth meeting, but note his inability (for whatever reason) to get the proceedings published in a timely fashion.
2. The Board should consider appointing a "Special Editor" for the express purpose of taking over tasks associated with the 2005 Perth manuscripts. As the Editor's duties are only generally described in the Bylaws of our society it would seem to be in the board's powers to delegate this specific task to a "Special Editor". I volunteer to do the job. I already have the contact addresses of nearly all attendees of the Perth meeting and can ask those who at the time have submitted papers for the proceedings and had those papers accepted by Jacob to send me copies of the manuscripts and all further relevant correspondence - reviewers' comments, replies

to reviewers, and Jacob's letters of acceptance. I can then correspond with the Chief Editor of Hydrobiologia Koen Martens and forward the package to him, hoping that the papers that had been accepted by Jacob will also pass the scrutiny of Dr. Martens and his staff.

3. If the matter cannot be settled in a Board meeting, I will not hesitate to call for a special (electronic) meeting of the ISSLR members to decide on the appointment of a new Editor for the proceedings of the 2005 symposium.

Of course I hope that this all will not be necessary if Jacob will now forward the manuscripts to the editorial office without delay and provide the Board now with a list of manuscripts to be included in the special issue of Hydrobiologia – provided that they will be approved by the Chief Editor as well.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 15 Jun 2008 02:46:10

Message:

I support this motion. I am at the end of my tether with Jacob. He has been procrastinating since the beginning of the year. Till then he was apparently delayed by 2-3 recalcitrant authors who took ages to submit their revisions. Since then it has been one excuse after another for the inordinate delay. Aharon has one fact misunderstood and that is that Jacob DID NOT say he submitted the mss a few months ago; this claim was only made in early May (apparently so that I could convey to authors at GSL that all was well). As of June 12 there is no word that he has submitted the mss, despite him claiming on June 4 that it would be done 'very soon.' To me, 'very soon' has expired, and either he is still misguidedly 'too busy' with University matters or he has more to do on the mss than I was lead to believe from numerous enquiries made at various times this year. Despite numerous requests, both officially from the Board via me, or unofficially from me as a supposed assistant editor, I am still in the dark about about the number of manuscripts or who the authors are.

I am sorry the matter has come to this, but I see no other solution but for Aharon to take over. I too have procrastinated in reacting to this continued slackness ---my enquiries always resulted in 'I am very busy and the mss will be submitted soon.' Hence I remained hopeful of a good outcome, but obviously I have been deluded. Of course, it will take a little while for Aharon to get the authors to send him their revised manuscripts and reviewers comments, but after that he will be lightning fast. I might add the editor-in-chief of Hydrobiologia is aware of our problems with Jacob's slackness.

Please comment/vote as soon as possible, so if this motion is passed, Aharon can get on with the job as soon as possible and quicker than 'very soon!'

Reply author: wurtsbaugh

Replied on: 15 Jun 2008 05:49:45

Message:

In response to Brian's comment of the June 4th deadline, I don't know how "rigid" that was. Only 11 days elapsed since then. It will take several weeks or more for Aharon to gather manuscripts and reviews from authors, particularly from those in the Northern Hemisphere who may not be at their campuses. Can we give Jacob a one week deadline to get the manuscripts to the Hydrobiologia editor. We could tell him that if they are not received by then, on day 8, Aharon will take over the editorship and contact all authors.

If other hard deadlines have been given (ones with a consequence), my suggestion is probably useless, but otherwise, it may provide a positive result.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 15 Jun 2008 06:49:23

Message:

Please note that Jacob John is still a member of the board and is part of this forum. I trust he has read and understood all earlier messages on the topic on the board forum. I hope that Jacob also reads the current exchange of ideas and I am looking forward to his reaction. With a little good will from his side (but without further delays and excuses that can no longer be accepted) we can achieve more than in any other way. One message from him that includes 1. a statement that the package has been sent to the editorial office by FedEx or another courier service, with data on the date sent, tracking number etc., and 2. a list of titles of the papers and their authors, will solve all problems.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 15 Jun 2008 12:55:20

Message:

Yes I agree with Aharon that a little goodwill from Jacob will get a better result than Aharon taking over the process. Surely he will submit the mss 'very soon,' but this is what I have been thinking for months but to no avail. I will email Jacob about joining this discussion, but I am not hopeful of even this, as he has not taken part in board discussions for two years. I still suggest we go ahead and at least pass the motion, so that we are ready for action after giving a severe warning to Jacob.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 15 Jun 2008 20:04:23

Message:

Today (Monday 16th) I have received an email from Jacob, saying he is GOING to submit the mss to Hydrobiologia TODAY. I suggest we halt this discussion till it has been confirmed that he has actually SENT (past tense) the mss to Hydrobiologia.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 15 Jun 2008 20:30:33

Message:

We have received similar messages from Jacob John in the past, without any result. Therefore I propose to continue voting on the motion until:

- We will have received proof that indeed the package has been sent, i.e., the tracking number of the package sent by FedEx or another courier service.
 - We will have a list of manuscripts and their authors, posted on the Board Forum by Jacob or anyone else from the board.
-

Reply author: shurlbert

Replied on: 16 Jun 2008 11:04:40

Message:

Leverage and efficiency can be increased by judicious use of cc and bcc...

While we don't want to dither further here, we may want to consider adding these elements to a revised motion:

- a letter to Johns be sent by regular email (over the names of all ISSLR officers) that includes a condensed chronology of this case, including promises made and broken by Johns, his refusal to respond to authors and the board, etc.

- the letter request that Johns send ALL his files on all the mss to Aharon by overnight delivery; this will save the work of doing this author by author.

- the letter specify that Aharon will be an official co-editor of the volume; and the only corresponding editor responsible for further dealings with Martens; it is likely that Aharon will indeed have a fair workload dealing both with Martens and with authors from whom Martens will want more revision.

- the letter should be copied to 1) Martens, 2) John's dept head and dean, and 3) all ISSLR board members.

This approach is fully justified and should halt this waste of our time. Stuart

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 16 Jun 2008 11:23:09

Message:

Agreed! And there is no need to worry about my workload - I will be able to cope.

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 26 Jul 2008 20:09:44

Message:

Everyone will be relieved to know that as of 15 July, Jacob has submitted the last manuscript (his own) to Hydrobiologia. I am sorry it has taken this long to make this announcement, but I had to be sure Jacob had done as he claimed and it is hard for me to find internet access here in the Outback of WA. Koen has been quick in his correspondance to me; I am the slow link. Now he has to re-edit ALL the mss again, and some may not make it.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 27 Jul 2008 00:55:39

Message:

I am really glad that the joint effort from Brian and from me has finally paid off. We should have reached this stage more than two years ago. Now let's hope that Koen will be happy with the manuscripts.

Then about the proceedings of the Salt Lake City symposium: we are really doing well here. My list of papers promised contains 37 full papers and 20 extended abstracts. The deadline for submission being the end of this month, I have thus far received 13 full papers and 6 extended abstracts, nearly all of excellent quality. All papers submitted thus far have been checked by me and if necessary I did (sometimes very extensive) language editing to help authors improving their papers before the review stage. I am happy that the quality of the material received thus far is very good. The papers have then been assigned to one of the members of the editorial team (Oren - Naftz - Wurtsbaugh), and some papers have already been reviewed by external reviewers. I will keep the board updated about the progress.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 31 Jul 2008 02:48:50

Message:

Now the first deadline of July 30 for submission of manuscripts for the proceedings volume of the Salt Lake City symposium has passed, here is a short update about the number of manuscripts received:

Full papers:

Submitted: 18

All these have already been checked, formatted, language-edited if needed, and when necessary returned to the authors to reply to queries. Most papers have already been forwarded to one of the members of the editorial team (Oren - Naftz - Wurtsbaugh) to start the reviewing process.

Promised in 1-2 weeks: 3

Pending (authors who have at the time indicated that they will submit a full paper; I will send out reminders tomorrow): 16

Extended abstracts:

Submitted: 14 - also here all have been checked for language, formatted, and queries have been answered if necessary

Soon to be expected: 1

Pending: 7

The material looks excellent, and I don't see any reason why we cannot have all material ready to be sent to the publisher in November as planned.

I will keep the board updated from time to time about the progress made.

Note that I will not be in e-mail contact from August 2 until August 9.

Reply author: jalcocer

Replied on: 05 Nov 2008 13:07:55

Message:

The Salt Lake City proceedings seem to be going on time; am I right Aharon? However, we have received no further information regarding Perth proceedings. Did the manuscripts reach Koen Martens? Do we have Koen's comments on the manuscripts? It has been long time since the last communication on this regard.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 05 Nov 2008 20:51:00

Message:

Indeed, the proceedings of the Salt Lake City meeting are almost ready to go to the printer - we have about 30 full papers and 20 extended abstracts; almost all the material has already been sent to the publisher, and these days we are finalizing the last three or four papers. As soon as the last chapters will have been finalized (probably within 1-2 weeks), I will post a message on this forum, with the complete list of contents of the proceedings. At the Salt Lake City meeting I announced that I intended to have the proceedings ready to be sent to the publisher by the end of November, and with the help of co-editors Dave Naftz and Wayne Wurtsbaugh we are making that deadline without any problems.

About the Perth proceedings: you should have gotten the details from Jacob John. Only a few weeks ago did John receive the verdict about the manuscripts from Koen Martens, the chief editor of Hydrobiologia. All manuscripts previously "accepted for publication" by Jacob have been reviewed once more by Dr. Martens, with the result that some were accepted, others were returned to the authors for additional revision (which is what happened to one of my two papers for the Perth proceedings), while still others were rejected, even after the guest editor had sent a letter of acceptance earlier). This was also the fate of my second Perth proceedings paper. Jacob now handles this second round of revisions, so you should contact him for information about your contribution(s) to the Perth meeting proceedings.

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 05 Nov 2008 20:51:09

Message:

Indeed, the proceedings of the Salt Lake City meeting are almost ready to go to the printer - we have about 30 full papers and 20 extended abstracts; almost all the material has already been sent to the publisher, and these days we are finalizing the last three or four papers. As soon as

the last chapters will have been finalized (probably within 1-2 weeks), I will post a message on this forum, with the complete list of contents of the proceedings. At the Salt Lake City meeting I announced that I intended to have the proceedings ready to be sent to the publisher by the end of November, and with the help of co-editors Dave Naftz and Wayne Wurtsbaugh we are making that deadline without any problems.

About the Perth proceedings: you should have gotten the details from Jacob John. Only a few weeks ago did John receive the verdict about the manuscripts from Koen Martens, the chief editor of Hydrobiologia. All manuscripts previously "accepted for publication" by Jacob have been reviewed once more by Dr. Martens, with the result that some were accepted, others were returned to the authors for additional revision (which is what happened to one of my two papers for the Perth proceedings), while still others were rejected, even after the guest editor had sent a letter of acceptance earlier). This was also the fate of my second Perth proceedings paper. Jacob now handles this second round of revisions, so you should contact him for information about your contribution(s) to the Perth meeting proceedings.

Reply author: jalcocer

Replied on: 06 Nov 2008 08:14:45

Message:

Thanks Aharon. Jacob, could you please let us know about Dr. Martens reply?

Reply author: aoren

Replied on: 09 Nov 2008 21:52:54

Message:

Dear friends,

I am pleased to let you know that the last chapter of the proceedings book of the Salt Lake City meeting has been finalized, and all material has now been forwarded to the publisher. We have 51 chapters - 28 full-length papers and 23 extended abstracts, + preface. At the meeting I announced that we expect to have the document ready to be printed by the end of November - we are three weeks early!

I will keep you updated about the production process. Here is the table of contents of the book:

Preface – Saline lakes around the world: unique systems with unique values
Aharon Oren, David L. Naftz & Wayne A. Wurtsbaugh

Preface – FRIENDS of Great Salt Lake
Lynn de Freytas

Great Salt Lake, Utah

Biostromes, brine flies, birds and the bioaccumulation of selenium in the Great Salt Lake, Utah
Wayne A. Wurtsbaugh

Microbial biodiversity of Great Salt Lake, Utah
Bart C. Weimer, Giovanni Rompato, Jacob Parnell, Balasubramanian Ganesan, Cristian Navas, Martin Gonzalez, Mario Clavel & Steven Albee-Scott

Development of a site-specific standard for selenium in open waters of Great Salt Lake, Utah
Harry M. Ohlendorf, Jeff DenBleyker, William O. Moellmer & Theron Miller

Mercury inputs to Great Salt Lake, Utah: reconnaissance-phase results
David Naftz, Christopher Fuller, Jay Cederberg, David Krabbenhoft, John Whitehead, Jodi Garberg

& Kimberly Beisner

Dynamics of mercury in eared grebes on Great Salt Lake
Nathan L. Darnall & A. Keith Miles

Eutrophication, nutrient fluxes and connectivity between the bays of Great Salt Lake, Utah (USA)
Wayne A. Wurtsbaugh, David L. Naftz & Shane R. Bradt

Competitive exclusion of cyanobacterial species in Great Salt Lake
Hillary C. Roney

Evidence and implications of movement of the deep brine layer in the South Arm of Great Salt Lake, Utah
Kimberly Beisner, David L. Naftz & William P. Johnson

Production of magnesium from Great Salt Lake, Utah, USA
Thomas G. Tripp

Developing vegetation metrics for the assessment of beneficial uses of impounded wetlands surrounding Great Salt Lake, Utah, U.S.A.
Heidi M. Hoven & Theron Miller

Farmington Bay wetlands of the Great Salt Lake: nutrient criteria, macroinvertebrate studies and beneficial uses
Theron G. Miller, Heidi M. Hoven & John F. Cavitt

Landforms of fetch-limited saline lakes as evidence of storm-wind direction and strength
Genevieve Atwood

Other North-American Salt Lakes

Avian response to early tidal salt marsh restoration at former commercial salt evaporation ponds in San Francisco Bay, California, USA
Nicole D. Athearn, John Y. Takekawa & Joel M. Shinn

Limnology and food web structure of a large terminal ecosystem, Walker Lake (NV, USA)
John Umek, Sudeep Chandra & Jacquie Brownstein

The effects of increasing total dissolved solids on the Walker Lake, Nevada, fishery
Karie A. Wright

Distribution of major anions and trace elements in the unsaturated zone at Franklin Lake Playa, California, USA
George N. Breit, Harland L. Goldstein, Richard L. Reynolds & James C. Yount

Dust emission at Franklin Lake Playa, Mojave Desert (USA): response to meteorological and hydrologic changes 2005-2008
Richard L. Reynolds, Rian Bogle, John Vogel, Harland Goldstein & James Yount

Recovery of the threatened lahontan cutthroat trout in a desert terminal lake
Stephanie Byers

Salt flat basin's contribution to regional dust production and potential influence on dry deposition in the Guadalupe Mountains (Texas, USA)
Adriana E. Perez & Thomas E. Gill

Geochemistry and potential playa sources of the January 7, 2008 southwestern New Mexico "milky rain"
Joel Gilbert, Thomas E. Gill, David Borrok, Bonnie Frey, Terry Hertel, Maria Lane, Max Bleiweiss, Chris Lehmann, David Gay & Chintalapalle V. Ramana

Planktonic bloom-forming *Nodularia* in the saline Lake Alchichica, Mexico
Martha Guadalupe Oliva, Alfonso Lugo, Javier Alcocer, Laura Peralta & Luis Alberto Oseguera

South-American Salt Lakes

Algal and cyanobacterial saline biofilms of the Grande Coastal Lagoon, Lima, Peru
Haydee Montoya T.

Managing salt lakes in the neotropics: challenges and alternatives - the case of Mar Chiquita, Argentina
Enrique H. Bucher & Erio D. Curto

Salt Lakes in the Great Rift Valley

Archaeal diversity in the Dead Sea: microbial survival under increasingly harsh conditions
Oded Bija, Idan Bodaker, Itai Sharon, Roi Feingersch, Mira Rosenberg, Aharon Oren, Muna Y. Hindiye & Hanan I. Malkawi

The negative water balance of the Dead Sea; its impact and the future of the lake
Ittai Gavrieli

Long-term mesocosm simulation of algal and archaeal blooms in the Dead Sea following dilution with Red Sea water
Aharon Oren, Jonah Gavrieli, Marco Kohen, Joseph Lati, Mordehay Aharoni & Ittai Gavrieli

Diel variability and community metabolism in African soda lakes
John M. Melack

Effect of osmotic downshock treatment on the yield of ectoine synthesized by *Halomonas* sp. EG6
Omneya Osman, Shoko Tanabe-Hosoi & Shinichi Nagata

Salt Lakes in Europe

Biodiversity of inland saltscapes of the Iberian Peninsula
Katia Hueso Kortekaas & Jesús-F. Carrasco Vayó

The role of non-governmental organizations in the conservation and management of saltscapes in Spain - the case of the Association of Friends of Inland Salinas
Jesús-F. Carrasco Vayó & Katia Hueso Kortekaas

Threatened *Artemia* biodiversity in the Iberian and western Mediterranean region
Stella Redyn, Marta Maccari, Germán Medina, Francisco Hontoria, Juan Carlos Navarro & Francisco Amat

The role of parasites in the successful invasion of Mediterranean salterns by the exotic invasive *Artemia franciscana*
Stella Redyn, Marta Maccari, Germán Medina, Francisco Hontoria, Juan Carlos Navarro, Boyko Georgiev, Gergana Vasileva, Pavel Nikolov & Francisco Amat

Natural curative factors of the Solotvino salt lakes
Ivan S. Lemko, Margarita O. Haysak, Kateryna I. Vaherich, Yuriy V. Andrashko, Irena J. Sharkany & Victoria G. Malynovska

The Role of phytoplankton in sediment formation in lakes with pelogenous potential
Liana Gheorghievici

Salt Lakes in Asia

The Aral Sea: water level, salinity and long-term changes in biological communities of an endangered ecosystem - past, present and future

Nickolay V. Aladin, Igor S. Plotnikov, Philip Micklin & Thomas Ballatore

The phytoplankton of the present-day central Caspian Sea

Larisa A. Pautova, Vladimir A. Silkin & Sergey V. Vostokov

Characterization of a eukaryotic picoplankton alga, strain DGN-Z1, isolated from a soda lake in Inner Mongolia, China

Kong Fanjing, Jia Qinxian, Er Jia & Zheng Mianping

Zabuye Salt Lake solar pond in Tibet, China: construction and operational experience

Huang Weinong, Wang Xuekui, Sun Zhinan, Nie Zhen & Sha Zuoliang

Crystallization path of salts from brine in Zabuye Salt Lake, Tibet, during isothermal evaporation

Zhen Nie, Lingzhong Bu, Mianping Zheng & Yongsheng Zhang

Solubility and supersaturation of lithium carbonate in Zabuye Salt Lake brine

Sha Zuo-liang, Huang Wei-nong, Wang Xue-kui & Zhao Yuan-yi

Separation and economic recovery of strontium from Nanyishan oil-field water, China

Ya Ping Dong, Qing Fen Meng, Hai Tao Feng, Xiang Mei Cui, Bin Xu, Wei Wu, Dan Dan Gao & Wu Li

Solubility of MgO in chloride melts containing NdCl₃ and LaCl₃

Bing Li, Jun Li, Jinzhong Chen & Jianguo Yu

Salt Lakes in Australia

A study of the saline lakes of the Esperance Hinterland, Western Australia, with special reference to the roles of acidity and episodicity

Brian V. Timms

The effects of mining on a salt lake in the Western Australian Goldfields

Bindy M. Datson

Waterbirds of the saline lakes of the Paroo, arid-zone Australia: a review with special reference to diversity and conservation

Brian V. Timms

Oxygen production and use in benthic mats of solar salt ponds

Mark U. Coleman

The effect of salt on germination of samphire species

Jacqueline E. Purvis, Bindy Datson, Kathy Meney, Jen McComb & Mark Coleman

Saline lakes – here, there and everywhere

Microbial diversity and microbial abundance in salt-saturated brines: why are the waters of hypersaline lakes red?

Aharon Oren

A population-specific marker within the superspecies *Artemia franciscana*

Stefania Maniatsi, Athanasios D. Baxevanis, Kalliopi Vasileiadou, Ilias Kappas & Theodore J. Abatzopoulos

Microbial communities in salt lakes: phylogenetic diversity, metabolic diversity, and in situ

activities. Summary of a roundtable discussion on our current understanding, limitations to our knowledge, and future approaches, Salt Lake City, 12 May 2008
Aharon Oren, Bonnie K. Baxter & Bart C. Weimer

Report of the ISSLR conference working session on lessons learned for setting agendas for saline lakes research
Genevieve Atwood

Reply author: jalcocer

Replied on: 10 Nov 2008 17:55:57

Message:

Great news. Congratulations and thanks!

Reply author: btimms

Replied on: 10 Nov 2008 22:23:14

Message:

Magnifo. This is by far the quickest of all ISSLR's 10 conferences. Congratulations. May others take note.

ISSLR Forums : <http://www.isslr.org/forums/>

© **International Society for Salt Lake Research**

[Close Window](#)