

## GuideLines: A New Series for CBE

**Miriam Bloom**, Managing Editor  
GuideLines

The long-awaited CBE guide series, now officially dubbed GuideLines, may still be awaited, but it won't be for too much longer. The first 2 GuideLines—one by Shirley Peterson and Susan Eastwood on poster sessions, the other by Shirley Peterson on editing graphs—are undergoing review right now. Both are packed with the kind of nitty-gritty that editors thirst after.

A GuideLine on teaching scientific writing is being prepared by Martha Tacker, even as she settles into Western living. And should she be concerned about her new house's style, Claudette Upton will come to the rescue with a GuideLine on in-house style manuals. That's on the level, but if you want to know which level, you will need Karyn Popham's GuideLine on editing for reading levels. This GuideLine will be useful for CBE members who edit consumer-targeted literature.

Freshly retired Bruce Squires is preparing our GuideLine on ethics for editors. (So

much for retirement.) It should be under review by the time you read this, as should Cynthia Chapman's GuideLine clarifying the complicated issues surrounding copyright. A GuideLine on editing grant proposals is being written by Karen Klein, who is handling it as editor *qua* partner for the fund-seeking investigator. Annette Flanagin is writing a GuideLine on meeting presentations; she will include techniques for presentations that use a lap-top computer. The conclusions of the CBE Peer Review Retreat Consensus Group (composed by Faith McLellan, Christy Wright, and Susan Eastwood), which appeared in *CBE Views* (1995;18(5):79-81), will be republished as a GuideLine. The consensus report cites the responsibilities of 1) peer reviewers to authors, editors, readers, and science, 2) editors to authors, peer reviewers, readers, and science, and 3) editors and peer reviewers to institutions. The GuideLine, like the consensus report, will be a working document, not intended to be viewed as a standard.

One topic on which consensus is hard to

come by, however, is levels of editing. Freelance editors must spell out precisely what is to be done with each new job or contract. Are we expected to correct errors only, or infelicities as well? What kind of infelicities? What kind of errors? Errors of spelling, grammar, and usage? What about technical errors? And what about inconsistencies? At what level of editing are we responsible if a figure is contradicted by the text? David Nadziejka, with the help of an ad hoc committee still forming, will tackle such questions in a levels-of-editing GuideLine.

Those are the GuideLines in the pipeline; others are being considered. If there is a subject that you would like to write about, please let me know. If there is a topic that you'd like to see a GuideLine on, please let me know that too; and if you send me names of potential authors, I will seek them out. Contact me by phone, 601-982-1800; fax, 601-982-1933; e-mail, [SciWrite@umsmed.edu](mailto:SciWrite@umsmed.edu); or mail, 4433 Wedgewood Street, Jackson MS 39211.