

Editorial

Organic Process Research & Development moves into its third year with this issue and goes from strength to strength. In every company or university I visit, and in each country I have traveled to this year, I have been complimented on the excellence of the journal and on how it has filled an important gap in the market. It has given a new focus for process chemistry and engineering which did not exist before. In 1999, the aim is to build on the first two years' progress.

It is encouraging to see that the journal has now become truly international. In the last issue of 1998 (Vol. 2, No. 6), there were not only articles from the USA and Europe but also three papers from Japan, two from India, and one each from China and New Zealand. Judging from the papers we are refereeing at present, this international trend will continue. Issue No. 6 of 1998 also contained more articles than previous issues, again a trend we aim to sustain in 1999.

There are still, however, areas for expansion. The majority of the articles come from chemistry departments in the pharmaceutical industry. Whilst we have received several excellent articles with more of a chemical engineering focus in 1998, there are simply not enough. Nor are we publishing sufficient articles from the academic world, where we suffer from the lack of process chemistry departments or the dearth of applied chemistry faculty. On the industrial front, papers from the agrochemical, speciality chemical, colour chemicals, and intermediates business areas are particularly welcome.

To assist with expansion of the journal, we have increased the size of the Editorial Advisory Board and widened the areas of expertise available to us. Full details of the new board will appear in the next issue. The new board has representatives from small as well as large companies, and the geographic spread has been increased.

Feedback from readers on particular articles or on general issues is welcomed by the editors. Issue No. 6 of 1998 contains some correspondence regarding technical issues with responses from the original author of the article. Future issues will continue this trend. Correspondence on how the journal will improve in the future is also welcome, as is constructive criticism. Please address correspondence to me or Richard Pariza and not to J. Arnett who has now left the editorial team.¹ I look forward to receiving your views.

Trevor Laird

Editor

(1) All manuscripts and correspondence regarding manuscripts should be sent to Richard Pariza or myself (see 1999 Guide for Authors, in this issue, for information on manuscript submission).