

As my editorial term, almost half-way already, gets farther and farther removed from when we of the *Isis-in-Utrecht* team were still young and inexperienced, my semi-annual reports keep getting shorter and shorter. After all, most novelties that have required a great deal of our attention over past years (about which I wrote at some length in earlier semi-annual reports) are by now solidly in place.

This is certainly true of the 8 % overage that is part of the new contract between HSS and the University of Chicago Press that became effective by the first of January of this year. As a result, we have now 896 pages available annually (16 more than before), with 72 pages more available on an annual basis (i.e., twice as many as before) without risking payment of penalties. Now that Joan Vandegrift has acquired an assistant (Barbara Condon), we are all set to explore how best to exploit the added space. It looks as if, starting with the September issue that came out a couple of weeks ago, we are now in a position regularly albeit perhaps not in every single issue to publish one extra article, i.e., four rather than three per issue. For as long as the standard number of articles published per issue was three, I aimed (in assumed, broad accordance with the membership's interests) at a balanced formula of one pre-1800 article, one 19th century, and one 20th century. Such a balance remains my ideal, and authors and referees have so far enabled me to stick to it, but I must now also seek a balance for the 'extra' article. The September issue has for extra article a methodological, diachronic one; the upcoming December 'extra' is pre-1800, and so it is in the June 2017 issue as currently foreseen, whereas the March 2017 issue will have a 19th century extra.

The above account is one telling way to express my current concern about a relative dearth of 20th century contributions, certainly of publishable ones. I do not have the impression that referees for that time period are significantly more severe than referees for other periods — it is the authors themselves who should enable me to maintain the balance. I have considered sending an appeal to them through the HSS Newsletter, and if the trend does not change soon, I will quite possibly do so. On the whole, however, I am satisfied that I need not set up hunts to get the next issue filled, nor disappoint authors of accepted manuscripts with a publishing date more than a year later than the acceptance date (note here that half a year's delay is minimal, shared equally between Joan's manuscript editing and UCP's production cycle).

Coming back to the subject of referees, I use the occasion of this report to sing their praise. True, from time to time but rarely so it proves hard indeed to make a referee stick to his or her promise to send me a timely report, and on a very rare occasion a report strikes me as insufficiently informative. Most often, however, I get reports of truly astonishing quality — sympathetic, constructive, with a keen eye on what would suit *Isis*, and analytically very astute, to the point where (with the author's, not the referee's preoccupations for point of departure) the referee may go so far as to suggest to the author in quite some detail how his or her own argument or lack thereof might be reorganized and thereby improved so as to turn it into a publishable piece of work. Most referees, then, are very good, yet it is the Advisory Editors Board that really and truly constitutes the backbone of the high-quality refereeing of which I am so gratefully at the receiving end.

After some preliminary exchanges in earlier years, we have now opened a dialogue with the Smithsonian Institution regarding the best way to keep fulfilling the 'Memorandum of Understanding between the Smithsonian Institution Archives and the History of Science Society' concluded about a dozen years ago under Mike Sokal's Presidency. The immediate occasion is that with the submission & tracking system 'Editorial Manager' (operative since March, 2015) we have acquired a system that, as it were, archives itself. Given that it automatically stores every manuscript in its various stages, further every referee report, every

editorial decision, every non-trivial communication with our authors and our referees, and also every book review in a (for us) easily accessible manner, the question is what if any kind of data still need to be sent to the Smithsonian, and in what format. We have also sought guidance from the Smithsonian Institution regarding certain terms in the Memorandum of Understanding that strike us as less than immediately obvious — one case in point being by what criteria to label certain manuscripts 'controversial'. It is my intention, before we take any actions that go beyond the routine currently in place, to take our plans in this regard up with the Executive Office and with the Committee on Publications.

For the bare facts of the past year regarding *Isis* manuscripts, as also for an overview of accepted manuscripts in upcoming issues, I refer to the pages that follow next. For everything else concerning *Isis* I refer to the reports by the book reviews editors and by the managing editor, and also of course to Stephen Weldon's report for the *CB* and to Suman Seth and Patrick McCray's first report for *Osiris*; all of which I am happy to endorse. In doing so I call special attention to Stephen's report. It addresses two mishaps of which I intend to discuss the consequences with him at some length and depth during the upcoming annual meeting; confident, however, that, given Stephen's well-known dedication and overall competence, he will find the best possible solutions.

Finally, I gratefully acknowledge, as before, ongoing support received from the Descartes Center, our institutional stronghold, further from the Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University, of the Museum Boerhaave, the Huygens Institute, and the Ammodo Foundation. Also as before, I regularly confer with Bert Theunissen in his capacity of Director of the Descartes Center.

H. Floris Cohen
Society Editor

History of Science Society Report

Semi-Annual Report – 1 October 2016

Isis Manuscript Overview

This Period: This column only includes decisions made regarding the 57 manuscripts received from 1 April 2016 – 30 September 2016

Last Period: This column shows decisions made regarding the 57 manuscripts submitted between 1 October 2015 and 31 March 2016. It also conveys the status of these manuscripts on 1 October 2016.

	This Period 1 April 2016 – 30 September 2016	Last Period 1 October 2015 – 31 March 2016	
New Submissions	57	57	
Status of submissions on	1 October 2016	1 October 2016	1 April 2016
Manuscripts Under Review	17 (30%)	0 (0%)	14 (25%)
Revise and Resubmit	1 (2%)	6 (11%)	2 (3%)
Accepted	2 (4%)	8 (14%)	5 (9%)
Rejected	37 (64%)	43 (75%)	36 (63%)
Withdrawn	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Manuscript Status by Author Gender

This table only includes decisions made regarding the 57 manuscripts received from 1 April 2016 – 30 September 2016

This Period 1 April 2016 – 30 September 2016	Female(s)	Male(s)	>1 Authors (Male & Female)	Declined/ No Response
Manuscripts Under Review	6 (11%)	11 (19%)	0	0
Revise and Resubmit	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0	0
Accepted	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0	0
Rejected	10 (18%)	25 (44%)	2 (3%)	0
Total = 57	17 (30%)	38 (67%)	2 (3%)	0

Isis Referee Overview

This Period: This column only includes decisions made regarding the 57 manuscripts received from 1 April 2016 – 30 September 2016

This Period 1 April 2016 – 30 September 2016	Total	Completed	Declined	Accepted but not yet completed
AE Review requests	27	16 (60%)	0	10 (37%)
		Male: 7 (45%) Female: 9 (55%)		Male: 6 (60%) Female: 4 (40%)
Review requests	33	10 (30%)	14 (42%)	6 (18%)
		Male: 9 (90%) Female: 1 (10%)	Male: 10 (71%) Female: 4 (29%)	Male: 5 (85%) Female: 1 (15%)
Preassessment AE Reviewer	16	12 (75%)	0	4 (25%)
		Male: 8 (66%) Female: 4 (34%)		Male: 1 (25%) Female: 3 (75%)
Preassessment Reviewer	10	10 (100%)	0	0
		Male: 5 (50%) Female: 5 (50%)		
Total requests	86	48 (47%)	14 (14%)	20 (20%)
		Male: 29 (60%) Female: 19 (40%)	Male: 10 (71%) Female: 4 (29%)	Male: 12 (60%) Female: 8 (40%)

Upcoming issues October 2016 report

ISSUE: December 2016

MANUSCRIPTS ACCEPTED	
MS	AUTHOR
The Longitude Error in Ptolemy's Map: The Accuracy of Ancient Cartography Reassessed	Dmitry Shcheglov
Francis Bacon and Magnetical Cosmology	Xiaona Wang
The Age of Methods: William Whewell, Charles Peirce, and Scientific Kinds	Henry Cowles
Species Complex: Classification and Conservation in American Environmental History	Peter Alagona
Eloge Faidra Papanelopoulou, 1978-2016	Theodore Arabatzis <i>et al.</i>
Viewpoint Clocks to Computers	Frans van Lunteren (position paper); Bernadette Bensaude-Vincent, Norton Wise, Patricia Fara, Hasok Chang; Raf De Bont, Harun Küçük

ISSUE: March 2017

MANUSCRIPTS ACCEPTED	
MS	AUTHOR
Medicinal Formulas and Experiential Knowledge in the Seventeenth-Century Epistemic Exchange Between China and Europe	Gianna Pomata
Rubbing Elbows and Blowing Smoke: Gender, Class, and Science in the Nineteenth-Century Patent Office	Kara Swanson
From Savagery to Sovereignty: Identity, Politics, and International Expositions of Argentine Anthropology (1878-1892)	Ashley Kerr
A Road Not Taken: Economists, Historians of Science and the Making of the Bowman Report	Harro Maas and Roger E. Backhouse
A Second Look <i>Leviathan and the Air-Pump</i>	Azadeh Achbari (survey of all reviews); Thomas Hankins, Dominique Pestre, John Heilbron, Paul Wood, Trevor Pinch; Jeroen Bouterse, Li Jing Jiang, Vivette García Deister, Alex Wellerstein; Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer

ISSUE: June 2017

MANUSCRIPTS ACCEPTED	
MS	AUTHOR
Mechanics in the 'Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes'	Christoph Lehner

Constructing Canals on Mars: Event Astronomy and the Transmission of International Telegraphic News	Joshua Nall
Jesuit Scientists, Mongol Fossils: The French Palaeontological Missions in China, 1923-1928	Chris Manias
Focus History of Science Museums: What Tales to Tell?	Ad Maas (organizer)