Editorial

This is the first issue of the fifth year of *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, and once again it is time to take stock. A full year of the journal has now been sent to every member of the American Society of Cell Biology as a benefit of membership. The response to this new policy has been entirely positive. Many who were already members of the Society have told us that they are happy to have the journal every month and surprisingly many new members told us that they were motivated to join the Society at least in part because a free subscription to *MBC* is among the benefits. The number of high-quality manuscripts has increased dramatically: we published nearly 30% more papers in 1995 than in 1994, and most of that growth was in the last six months of the year. Although it is still too early to be entirely certain, it appears that the increased financial costs associated with growth in both circulation and number of pages published will be met in a timely way by increases in advertising revenue.

It seems to me also that we are making good progress toward the goal of providing a scholarly forum for the publication of original research in all the fields that comprise the interests of the members of the Society. The papers we receive are coming from an ever-widening span of fields. This is not to say that we are entirely satisfied with the distribution of manuscripts: we still hope to attract more papers in fields that seem to us still under-represented. In order to meet the requirements for scholarly and professional review of ever more diverse manuscripts, we will be adjusting membership in the Editorial Board, and have received from the Society's Publications Committee additional latitude in making appointments to it.

We have written and said many times before that *MBC* exists to publish scientific papers, and not to stand in the way of their publication. A central issue of editorial judgment that recurs from time to time (thankfully not very often) concerns the fate of manuscripts reporting credible results competently described, which nevertheless seem to the reviewers and editors to lack enough novelty or significance to merit publication. Sometimes these clearly are simple repetitions of published work in a different tissue or organism. Such studies are warned against in the Instructions to Authors and are properly rejected outright. Other times, however, there can be honest disagreement concerning the importance of finding a result similar to that already published in a different cell type, organism, or circumstance. In such cases at the margin judgement is called for. At *MBC* we strive always to keep our minds open to the case authors make for publication, but in the end I hope that our authors will understand that sometimes we just have to decide. What we promise is that we will decide, to the best of our abilities, on the basis of the scientific issues alone.

Finally, I want once again to thank the many dedicated people who make the continuing success of the journal possible: the Associate Editors and members of the Editorial Board, Editor Keith Yamamoto, Art Editor Joe Gall, and especially Managing Editor Ro Kampman and her able staff.

David Botstein
Editor-in-Chief