The joys of editing *Science Editor* include staying alert for material likely to interest readers. Whether I’m reading a journal, attending a conference, browsing in a bookstore, or talking with colleagues, the constant—and not always conscious—search for *Science Editor* content makes me feel more engaged. In short, I enjoy having an editorial eye.

In the current issue of *Science Editor*, the cover story, on creating crossword puzzles in the sciences, reflects some workings of that eye. The idea for the story arose at a book-exhibit table at a conference last fall. During times when buyers were few, I chatted with the author next to me, Laurie Lewis. Her work, I learned, included preparing crossword puzzles for science-related publications. I wondered how such puzzles were created—and thought that readers of *Science Editor* also might like to know. I accepted my invitation to submit a feature story. For the result, please see page 82.

Sometimes the editorial eye lights on items to share with *Science Editor* staff. “Walter or Stephanie, I received a flier about this book; should we consider assigning it for review?” “Lynn, I saw this article mentioned on a listserv; might it be a candidate for Views Afeld?” “Della, a member called me about this problem; might it form the basis for a question in Solution Corner?” Of course, my *Science Editor* colleagues may pursue such leads or not. An editorial eye can be highly fallible.

Just how fallible recently became clear. On opening the 1 December issue of Science, I found listed in the table of contents a piece titled “Survival Is Impossible Without an Editor”. At last, I thought, science editors are getting their due! I envisioned seeking permission to reprint the piece. Or at least I saw myself basing a Viewpoint on it.

On turning to the piece, however, I recognized that the editorial eye had failed. A figure, tantalizingly captioned “Editing makes a difference”, showed enzymes and RNA segments and mice. And the piece began with language that seemed far more genetic or biochemical than redaction-related. By the fourth sentence, it was clear that the piece addressed editing not of manuscripts but of RNA. Hmmm . . . Anyone want to submit a piece on editing as metaphor? Or on distinguishing publication editing from RNA editing when doing an online literature search? An editorial eye does not surrender easily.

My editorial eye, of course, is that of only one person. Fortunately, *Science Editor* reaches many editorial eyes. If you come across material that might interest fellow science editors, please let me know—for other joys of editing *Science Editor* include receiving fine ideas from readers.
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