When I heard that CBE Views would be redesigned, my first thought was, Great! We’ll have eye-catching headlines, large-type copy liberally sprinkled with slick graphics, and of course, four-color printing throughout. Then budgetary realities set in, and a more analytic (some would say saner) approach seemed called for.

At the gentle suggestion of Editor Barbara Gastel, we set out to define which elements of the old publication worked and which didn’t, so that we might concentrate our efforts on improving the latter rather than changing something merely for change’s sake. What you hold in your hand is what we’ve come up with so far.

Science Editor is what we’ve come up with so far.

The most obvious change is in the paper: SE is printed on recycled coated stock, Mountie Matte, a lovely bright white, highly opaque paper that should improve halftone reproductions considerably.

As for typefaces, instead of 10-point Garamond, we are now using Goudy Old Style for all copy and titles, still 10-point on 12-point leading, but it looks larger because Goudy is a heavier face. Some might say that the copy font needs to be even larger for aging eyes or that this traditional favorite is hackneyed and we should have tried a sans serif face; I wouldn’t disagree. Goudy is a compromise choice that we hope will please 50% of our readers—and the italics are charming! For running heads and in-box items, we are using Futura, a clean but rather soulless sans serif face.

Inside, the copy generally retains the three-column format, although with different margins and freer use of white space. The beautiful cover design and many other ideas emerged largely from a brainstorming session in Montreal last year. Sally Edwards, Peggy Robinson, Miriam Bloom, and Polya Potter contributed valuable suggestions and solutions; they are responsible for everything you like about SE. Nevertheless, the result might have been a camel had it not been for Tiffany Inbody, our talented designer, who interpreted vague and often mixed messages into what you see today. And as you might guess, the final product was tempered by Barbara Gastel, whose steady hand and remarkable good sense are rare indeed.

The hawk-eyed among you will have noticed some stylistic changes appearing in the January-February issue of SE. Foremost is the return to spelled-out single-digit numbers except for units of measure. The previous policy of using numerals was an effort by CBE Views to be consistent with and acquaint readers with the style recommended in Scientific Style and Format. Whether the attempt was successful or not, we no longer feel it necessary to continue the practice.

A more subtle change is the use of superscripts, rather than parentheses, to denote citations. You might also spot a trend toward open punctuation—fewer commas—and a tendency to make formerly hyphenated terms solid or to drop the hyphen when the meaning is clear. These modifications, minor as they may seem, have been the cause of considerable debate among the staff. Trying to reach consensus on these and other weighty issues are Norman Grossblatt, Lorraine Loviglio, Roxanne Young, and I, with the editor as tie-breaker and arbiter. I thank them for their contributions and for keeping me humble.

I welcome your comments on our new look and style. Like our parent organization, Science Editor will continue to evolve, albeit by punctuated equilibrium, to adapt to a changing constituency. Enjoy the ride!

Grace Darling
Publication Manager