

EDITORIAL

FOLIA MALACOLOGICA

– ACCOMPLISHMENTS & PROSPECTS

Much has changed since 2000 and it is not only that the new century has begun. In *Folia Malacologica* 8(1) (“Our 2000+ policy”), we tried to describe the best editorial policy for the next few years. There were three guidelines: first was variety, second – many manuscripts to choose from, third – increasingly thorough refereeing process. Now we are glad to say (and quite justified in saying so) that during the past year we have moved precisely along these guidelines. This was due not only to the policy of the EDITORIAL BOARD, but also to all the numerous AUTHORS and all the REFEREES. The AUTHORS not only submitted their manuscripts (too many to be processed immediately) but also, informed about the REFEREE’s remarks, revised their papers right away and returned them promptly. Great thanks to all the 2000 AUTHORS! The REFEREES, being no doubt burdened with their other, malacological or unmalacological duties, were quick to react and sent their reviews immediately: by mail, fax or letter, or sometimes they even told us on the phone what should be done to improve this or that manuscript. Great thanks to all the 2000 REFEREES!

We can well say that there is a variety in the journal. In 2000 we published 20 papers, some of them of considerable size, on 10 family-level taxa (and some, e.g. ecological, papers dealing with many taxa), plus 5 book reviews and conference reports. The AUTHORS came from 17 institutions (5 of them foreign) and 5 countries; the sex ratio among them was 1:1. Some of the papers were doctoral theses which means that, in spite of all the well-known difficulties, the number of young malacologists is increasing. The only thing that could be improved is book reviews – there is always place for them, and we still do not receive as many as we would wish. Why? Reading a book (and we believe all of us read books) and NOT writing a review is simply losing an opportunity. All reviews, even the shortest, are welcome. The same is true of conference reports. Our journal is not only to inform about the re-

sults of malacological studies; it should also tell us all what is going on.

As regards the number of manuscripts submitted: in 2000 we received a total of 37, some of which are still waiting to be revised and published; now we have 15, at various stages of processing, waiting for publication, and new manuscripts are still being... well, if not exactly showered on us, then at least we receive quite a few each month.

As far as refereeing goes, we can not complain either. None of the REFEREES since 1998 has refused to write a review, and only one provided us with only verbal remarks, not accompanied by any written statement. None of the REFEREES needed more than 2 weeks to write a review! And they were right: our journal is not just a routine job, it is still being born and we must take good care of it. The more crazy we are about it, the better!

All this pertains to our own journal. Besides, the scope of the papers submitted in 2000 makes it possible to recognise some trends in contemporary malacology, on both Polish and global scale. In *Folia* 2000, 28% papers dealt with aquatic molluscs/malacocenoses, papers on terrestrial molluscs constituted 38%, the respective values for fossil mollusc papers (both terrestrial and aquatic) and other papers being 16% and 18%. The prevailing branches of malacology in *Folia* 2000 were: systematics & evolution 28%, ecology & conservation 22%, fossil & subfossil molluscs/assemblages 16%, life cycles & population dynamics 12%. In the Abstracts of the 1998 World Congress of Malacology, the proportion was: systematics & evolution 38%, ecology & conservation 14%, fossil & subfossil molluscs/assemblages 10%, life cycles & population dynamics 14%, and thus similar; even if the difference (in favour of ecology & conservation) is statistically significant, it is not great. In the Abstracts of the 16th Polish Malacological Seminar (pp. 286–298 in *Folia* 8(4)), the proportion was: systematics & evolution 16%, ecology & conservation

41%, fossil & subfossil molluscs/assemblages 5%, life cycles & population dynamics 16%, and thus roughly similar, except the (again! see above) bias towards ecology & conservation, and all this is in agreement with the 15-year trend shown in Figure 19 in POKRYSZKO & RIEDEL (Folia 7(4): pp. 275–291). The most fashionable studies in the World and in Poland are those in molecular systematics (see e.g. MAZAN & SZAROWSKA in Folia 8(3) and 8(4) or RYBSKA et al. in Folia 8(4)) and phylogeny, the latter being often supported also with non-molecular characters. Ecology & conservation are even more fashionable, and more so in Poland than elsewhere; does the fact reflect the increasing ecological and environmental consciousness or simply the possibility to obtain funding? Or both? Most papers by young malacologists (30 and young-

er), both in Poland and in the World, deal with systematics & evolution and ecology & conservation and thus it can be expected that within the next few decades of the new century malacology will develop in these two directions. Does this reflect real interest? Fashion? Possibility to obtain funding?

Irrespective from fashion or funding, we are not going to give priority to any branch of malacology. Like before, anything good and malacological will be accepted by Folia in 2001. All of you are welcome to submit your papers on any aspect of any mollusc!

Great thanks for your kind cooperation (and more cooperation, please), and best wishes for the Malacological Year 2001, and for the 21st century!

EDITORIAL BOARD