this is totally unacceptable. The third is to get the law changed—and to stay the hand of the Postal Service until this can be done. We believe that the third alternative is the only one acceptable—on both moral and practical grounds—to the scientific community and to the publishers of scientific information. Such an action requires the mobilization of this community in terms of lobbying, letter writing, and the legal measures available to it. Failure to act in this situation will impose ethical and practical limitations that are both distasteful and unacceptable.

Michael R. Rosen
Brian F. Hoffman

And More about Money

The current question concerning the payment of page charges and its relation to the cost of mailing the Journal is only one aspect of the general problem of the ever rising cost of publishing and distributing a journal like Circulation Research. Ideally, revenue from subscriptions should be sufficient to defray all costs. However, if the subscription price were to be increased for this purpose, the number of subscribers would decrease. As a result, not only might there be no increase in total income from subscriptions, there even might be a loss of advertising revenues. More important, if there were fewer subscribers, the contents of the Journal almost certainly would reach fewer readers. This would defeat the purpose of the Journal, which is to make available to the widest possible audience the results of recent significant studies on the heart and circulatory system.

We can make use of other means either to obtain additional revenue or to serve as a substitute for income from page charges. It would be possible, for example, to charge for the review of all the manuscripts we receive or to make an initial charge for review and an additional charge for editorial services. Under such a system, however, authors whose papers were not accepted for publication would be required to contribute to the Journal and this seems unfair. The "obvious" solution of increasing the number of pages of advertising in the Journal is more difficult than it might seem because (1) our total distribution is limited—an unattractive proposition to advertisers—and (2) many advertisers believe that, for the most part, our readers are not appropriate consumers.

While we work toward solution of these problems, we shall do our best to decrease the costs of publication without sacrificing the quality of the Journal. First, we have initiated more efficient means to publish the Journal. Waverly Press, Inc., has adopted a new Composition Formatting System that will reduce the need for traditional copy preparation and, at the same time, will increase the accuracy of the final composition. Contributors to the Journal will notice, when they receive galley proofs, that many of the traditional instructions from the reductor have been replaced by cryptic commands to a computer. At first this will be confusing and perhaps unsettling; we have been assured that no matter how incomplete the redaction may appear, the finished product will be as excellent as ever.

Second, some savings will be effected by the manner in which we, as editors, process the manuscripts. A substantial part of the cost of publication results from changes in the galleys requested by the authors or required by our queries to the authors. We plan to make some changes in our editing of manuscripts to help keep such costly changes to a minimum.

Finally, a real saving can be realized if authors make every effort to refrain from suggesting nonessential changes in galley. If, in redaction, we have made modifications to conform to the style preference of the Journal, and the author, in the galleys, returns the text to the original, the cost of publishing that paper increases. Every comma inserted, every comma deleted takes time, hence costs money. In short, we will make a determined effort to provide authors with galleys that should require minimal change. It is our hope that authors, in turn, will suppress the urge to make any alteration that is not essential to the meaning of the text.

Brian F. Hoffman
Michael R. Rosen