

## Editor's Message

---

The past year has been very busy with Wanda Seyler and myself continuing to learn more about publishing a journal. We would like to thank all the reviewers and everyone that has visited the Journal's online site<sup>1</sup>. If you have not seen the site, I encourage you to visit and create an account. Once you have an account, we will provide you with a membership subscription, which enables you to read the latest science articles. If you have any problems, please let us know.

The Editorial Board is becoming more involved in setting policies for the Journal. The Board discusses issues that come up and determining what long-term policies to set. With moving to online publishing there are numerous issues. One of the biggest issues involves how fast, and to what extent, the Journal should move to online publishing and away from print. Should members continue to receive a printed Journal or is an online subscription sufficient? How are we going to handle library subscriptions with online publishing? What impact will changes in publishing have on advertising revenue? If you would like to get more involved, please let me know. A new Board member is elected each year to serve for a five year term. Let me know if you are interested in being on the Editorial Board.

Science papers for 1979-1985 and the complete 2012 Journal are currently available online. Work continues to add additional years. Science articles older than one year are openly accessible and anyone can download full articles in PDF format. The idea of open access for research articles has been a hot topic over the past year. Both in Europe<sup>2</sup> and the United States<sup>3</sup> there have been major high-level changes to require authors to publish in journals that provide immediate open access for publicly funded research. The funding model changes with open access publishing. Immediate open access removes income from subscription fees and requires the Journal's income to come more from page charges.

Open access results in more people being able to read science articles; however, many of the people that have gained access may not have the background to understand the article. Furthermore, many people may believe that because an article appears in a peer-reviewed journal, that everything in the articles is 100% accurate. I even heard many well-educated scientists express the view that they believe everything that appears in highly respectable journals. My view is closer to John Ioannidis's<sup>4</sup> opinion that we need to be skeptical of published results. My publishing philosophy is that articles should present new material and provide sufficient details to enable others to reproduce the work. Hence, we need to convey to people that some results have a totality of evidence from many studies, while remembering that a single published result may be incorrect.

Dr. David J. Delene  
Journal of Weather Modification Editor 2012-2013

### References:

<sup>1</sup><http://www.weathermodification.org/publications/>

<sup>2</sup><http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/index.cfm?fuseaction=public.topic&id=1294&lang=1>

<sup>3</sup><http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/02/22/expanding-public-access-results-federally-funded-research>

<sup>4</sup>Ioannidis JPA (2005) Why most published research findings are false. PLoS Med 2(8): e124.