INSECTA MUNDI

Editor Guidelines
Version July 2014 (available at http://www.centerforsystematicentomology.org/)

Chief Editor. Receives all manuscripts (MS) for processing and does the following.
1) Check to see that all necessary documents are received. If not, alerts author to correct.
   a) Manuscript and images.
   b) Two critical reviewer comments (not letters of support).
   c) Two Reviewer Report forms, one for each review.
   d) Signed contract form.
2) Check briefly to see that glaring problems don't exist. If some exist, it is rejected or sent back to the author to correct and resubmit.
3) If all generally looks good, at the end of the Literature Cited, adds the following: "Received [date], Accepted [date]. Review Editor: [name]".
4) Makes an entry in a manuscript tracking file stating the manuscript has been submitted and is being processed.
5) Sends manuscript and associated files to the Review Editor named in #3 above. Thus, each paper worked on by a Review Editor will acknowledge them in print.
6) Sends an e-mail to the author stating the manuscript is being forwarded to the Review Editor, copying the note to Review Editor to initiate contact with the author.
7) When the manuscript is accepted, records it is accepted in the manuscript track file
8) When the manuscript is completed and released, records this in the manuscript tracking file that is has been completed.

Editor as Author. Any Insecta Mundi Editor wishing to publish in our journal, even as a coauthor, will NOT be acting as the Review Editor for their manuscript. We will ensure fair treatment of ALL manuscripts. No special treatment will be allowed.

Review Editor. Once a manuscript has been turned over to you, it is your task to process it. Depending on manuscript flow, you may receive a manuscript that is not in your preferred group. While you may feel uncomfortable reviewing a manuscript outside of your area of expertise, you can easily handle the editing task for any group. See the first Rules of Thumb discussion below.
   Review Editors are to take manuscripts through the following steps, working towards completion.
1) After receipt of a manuscript and associated documents, keep track of where it is throughout the process. Authors invariably have questions.
2) Check to see the authors received adequate reviews and that the reviewers' comments were considered with any necessary corrections being made. This is similar to any other journal's Subject Editor task, with the exception that the author provided the reviews. If the reviews are inadequate, you can request the author get better, or provide one yourself. If you find problems with a manuscript, and see that the submitted reviews were poor, you should request the authors seek additional, more critical reviews, or if the paper is really bad, it may simply be rejected.
3) Look the manuscript over **in detail** to confirm author has followed all manuscript preparation rules and manuscript common problems checklist. Copy editing for journal style consistency is also done here. In doing this process, you may be acting as a reviewer if you find additional concerns. See following section for comments that will help you keep your sanity.
4) If there are major concerns, send it back to the author stating the concerns that need consideration or correction made before you consider it further. If it is really bad, you may reject it. If rejected, inform the Chief Editor this has happened and why it was rejected.
5) If there are minor or extensive but fixable concerns, send it back to the author to correct. If the concerns are really minor, you can address them yourself using track changes, returning the file to the author for their approval. This all depends on the degree and number of concerns, as well as the author and your level of commitment to see the manuscript published.

6) There may be a series of correspondences with an author before the manuscript is ready for the next stage.
7) Once you feel the manuscript is cleaned and ready for layout, have another Review Editor or member of the Editorial Board look it over to see if there are any problems. This is simply a form of checks and balances to help prevent you from making serious mistakes. If asked to look over another Review Editor's manuscript, for this step, you should only need to give it a quick review to confirm it is in good shape.
8) Once the second Editor has approved the manuscript and any corrections are made, the manuscript can be accepted for publication and the author notified of acceptance.
9) Record the date the manuscript was accepted in the statement following the Literature Cited (see Chief Editor notes #3).
10) Organize the finished manuscript, plates, appendices, etc., (but not all of the reviewer documents) and send them to a Layout Editor to create the page proof. Copy the message to the Chief Editor which will inform them it has been accepted and who has the manuscript.
11) When completed, the Layout Editor will return a page proof in PDF form.
12) Review the PDF page proof yourself because some problems will be visible that were not visible before, the Layout Editor may have made a mistake, accidentally deleted a heading, missed placing a tab, misspelled a name in the heading, or any other of many strange formatting concerns may appear like a loss of italics or various symbols. If these are major, alert the Layout Editor. If they are minor, note them for later, and send the PDF page proof to the author. Then work with the author and Layout Editor as needed to get author approval of the page proof. We cannot publish until the author has approved the page proof.
13) When the proof has been approved by the author, return any final corrections to the Layout Editor to complete the process.
14) You are done!! Layout Editors complete the cover and other tasks for final release.

Layout Editors. Layout Editors take the various documents and build the finished paper in programs designed to layout publications.
1) Layout Editors receive accepted manuscripts and associated files from the Review Editor. They produce the PDF page proof showing the author what the final product will look like, lacking only a few minor heading details and the cover.
2) The page proof is returned to the Review Editor to review and to send to the author for their final approval.
3) With author approval, the final corrections to the page proof are sent to the Layout Editor who contacts the Head Layout Editor that the manuscript is ready to be finalized and released.
4) The Head Layout Editor assigns an official article number, assigns a date for the publication to be released, and registers the article with ZooBank.
5) These data are provided to the Layout Editor who completes the manuscript and creates the final Cover for the article.
6) Once done the completed manuscript with cover is returned to Head Layout Editor and/or Chief Editor to check one last time for any errors in the publication. If any problems are found they are corrected.
7) Once all is 'perfect', the publication is sent to the Head Layout Editor for posting on our website, notification of members it is published, and completion of the ZooBank registration.
8) The Chief Editor and Post Production volunteers take the article and handle post-production processes.

Reviewing-Editing Rules of Thumb

I have a problem of helping too much. There were a few papers I should have rejected simply for being sloppy or because the author could not understand what was expected. They cost me too much of my time trying to get them to do the required work. Equally bad, sometimes I gave up and corrected the manuscript myself. These cases are very infrequent, but memorable. I strongly recommend you do not allow yourself to fall into that trap. These reasons are primarily why there are guidelines and rules for publication in Insecta Mundi.
Other insights follow that may help you process papers cleanly and save your sanity.

1) **Editing is not reviewing**, but most people do not realize the differences. Reviewing is a critical evaluation of the manuscript that confirms the science is good and the presentation is clear, concise, and consistent. Editing is the process to confirm the manuscript is clean following journal standards and help see the paper through the publication process. Hopefully reviewers and authors have cleaned manuscripts to the point Editors only need to edit for journal styles and standards. Most manuscripts submitted in the last seven years fall into the 'good submission' category and were rapidly published. Most of the following comments refer to the few, more problematic submissions.

2) Authors publishing with Insecta Mundi for the first time are often problematic. I recommend you help them as much as possible, but make them do the work and learn our processes. Remember the old proverb, "Give a man a fish, feed him for the day. Teach a man to fish, feed him for life." Their next manuscript will be much better.

3) Always read the narrative texts to confirm the English or Spanish are clear. If the text is only slightly problematic in a few places, help the author correct the grammar. If the text is very problematic, return the manuscript and have the author get additional reviews from native speakers. As an Editor, it is not your job to clean them up.

4) As an Editor, avoid getting stuck on your pet peeves if they are truly just your pet peeve. Be critical of yourself with these concerns, and back off as necessary. Many of our 'pet peeves' are fully acceptable by the majority of the community. A pet peeve of mine is the use of a colon or semicolon between a scientific name and the cited reference using that combination in a synonymy. I have reasons why I prefer using an m-dash or tilde. No one else feels as I do, so I let it slide.

   If an author consistently presents something that is a pet peeve and it is neither right nor wrong, then it is probably acceptable and not worth your effort to argue. However, feel free to politely bring up the concern with the author. If their counter argument is valid, then accept it and move on.

5) As an Editor, it is not our place to force changes to a manuscripts to follow our ideas. If an author makes a valid case to support their claim, then we cannot reject a paper simply because you do not agree.

   For example: a manuscript is submitted recognizing several new genera that I feel are meaningless. I agree more genera are necessary, but I disagree with the characters used and final organization of included species (solid phylogenetic data or not). The authors present full data supporting their claims and the paper is a contribution furthering our knowledge. As an editor, I cannot reject the paper because I simply disagree with them. As a researcher, if I am to counter their claim, I must publish my own paper presenting my own data. This is how science is supposed to function. As Editors, we must remain impartial and consider papers without personal biases.

6) Remember that there are many different writing styles, many that are traditions within different taxa. Be tolerant of different styles and remain open minded to other ways of presenting information. Remember your way is not the only acceptable way.

   For example, in synonymies presenting a new genus-species combination, do you add the author's name in parentheses, or just present the combination and citations that use it? In the following example, the bolded author name can be omitted in some styles. Omitting these author names is another of my pet peeves, but acceptable for publication in Insecta Mundi.

   > *Examplus speciosus* Authorson, 1801: 342.
   > *Paraexamplus speciosus* (**Authorson**): Smith 1898: 42.

7) Remember, no manuscript is perfect or as complete as we would like, and the authors may agree. We want papers to be good, but we don't want them becoming stuck in the publication process over petty details. Ask the question: "Is this paper a contribution, a step forward?" If the answer is yes, then help the author resolve any concerns and move it forward to publication.

8) We do not want to make rules for everything. The rules for Insecta Mundi are complicated enough for first time authors and Editors. With experience, you will find may situations that are exceptions to nearly every one of our rules. More rules only mean more work for editors to enforce them. Use your best judgment with these cases.

9) You will probably spend a fair amount of time cleaning minor errors based on Journal style. This is to be expected. If these seem extensive, have the authors fix them. However, be warned, when the manuscript is returned you must again check to confirm the author was consistent in making required corrections on the version of the manuscript you returned, not a previous version, and they did what was asked. There is a balance you will learn between forcing authors to do the work, and just doing it because it is quicker and more efficient. Hopefully our new Manuscript Preparation Guidelines, Common Problems Checklist, Reviewer Report, and Manuscript Submission Contract will make authors understand their place in the process.

In closing, your function is to help others publish in Insecta Mundi. Keep an open mind, but if a manuscript is problematic, then make authors do most of the work or reject it. You will develop your own rules and ways to process manuscripts that will meet with Insecta Mundi requirements. GOOD LUCK! It is personally rewarding to

know you helped facilitate others' research. The more you help, the better you will become in building your own manuscripts.

As always, feel free to ask questions to clarify concerns. The Chief Editor and Editorial Board are there to help resolve new problems or concerns when they arise. We are a team and you are not alone in this process.

Paul E. Skelley (July 2014)
Insecta Mundi, Chief Editor
Center for Systematic Entomology
P.O.Box 141874
Gainesville FL 32614-1874 USA
InsectaMundi@gmail.com