

Memo 4C-3/124

To: Distribution
From: H.D. Lemmel *Lammel*
Subject: Cinda publication schedule
Reference: 4C-2/63 of 75-5-28

16 June 1975

The NDCC Committee recommended for consideration a publication mode of Cinda, whereby the book would be split into an 'early' and a 'late' volume, containing the references published before or after 1 Jan 1970, respectively. The early volume would have a life-time of 3 to 5 years, and the late volume would appear annually as a cumulative issue plus a supplement.

This proposal seems well worth to be examined. The following considerations show, however, that the NDCC proposal brings no savings compared to the two-years publication cycle, and that there are other disadvantages. We would therefore prefer the two-years publication cycle.

May we ask NDCC to present these considerations to the NDCC Committee and to inform us of its reaction. Please note that we must submit the matter in August at latest to the INDC.

Distribution:

L. Lesca, NDCC (5)
S. Pearlstein, NNCSC (5)
V. Manokhin, CJD (5)

NDS: P.M. Attree
A. Calamand
H.D. Lemmel
A. Lorenz
K. Okamoto
J.J. Schmidt
G. Lammer
file

Prof. H. Goldstein

Clearance: J.J. Schmidt *J.J. Schmidt*

1. Calculation of page-numbers:

The page number increment was rather constant in the past years with 250 pages for a half-year supplement and with 200 pages increment per year for the cumulative issue. The reason for the relatively large volume of the supplement is threefold:

1. it includes revisions of earlier entries,
2. it includes progress-reports which are important when they are new but which are lateron deleted from the book (so-called "no-book flag" operation),
3. it has more space-consuming headlines per page.

The following estimates are based
in col.1 on 250 pages per half-year supplement,
in col.2 on 200 pages per half-year supplement assuming more restrictive criteria for the inclusion of revisions of earlier entries.

a. Two-years publication cycle:

		<u>col.1</u>	<u>col.2</u>
Spring 1976:	Cinda 76/77: in 3 volumes split by Z	2300 pages	2300
Fall 1976:	Suppl. 1:	250	200
Spring 1977:	Suppl. 2 (incl.Suppl.1):	500	400
Fall 1977:	Suppl. 3 (incl.Suppl.2):	750	600
Spring 1978:	Cinda 78/79: in 3 volumes	2700	2700
Fall 1978:	Suppl. 1:	250	200
Spring 1979:	Suppl. 2 (incl.Suppl.1):	500	400
Fall 1979:	Suppl. 3 (incl.Suppl.2):	750	600
Total in 4 years:	12 volumes	8000 pages	7400

b. NDCC proposal:

Spring 1976:	Cinda old (ref-date ≤ 1969) in 2 volumes split by Z	1200** pages	1200
	Cinda 76 new (ref-date > (1970) in 2 volumes split by Z	1100**	1100
Fall 1976:	Suppl.:	250	200
Spring 1977:	Cinda 77 new in 2 volumes	1300	1300
Fall 1977:	Suppl.:	250	200
Spring 1978:	Cinda 78 new in 2 volumes	1500	1500
Fall 1978:	Suppl.:	250	200
Spring 1979:	Cinda 79 new in 2 volumes	1700	1700
Fall 1979:	Suppl.:	250	200
Total in 4 years:	14 volumes	7800 pages	7600

**The split of Cinda in the "old" and "new" parts was done according to Nigel's estimate (4C-2/63, para 1.) that the volume > 1970 would be slightly smaller than the volume ≤ 1969.

Conclusion:

Within the limits of accuracy of this estimate both publication proposals will require an equal amount of paper, that is about 7700 ± 300 pages in 4 years. If the amount of revisions to be included in the supplements decreases even further, then the two years publication cycle will require noticeably less paper than the NDCC proposal.

2. Other considerations

- a. Full information on a given reaction can be obtained
- by consulting 1 or 2 books (= main issue + one supplement) in the case of the 2-years publication cycle,
 - by consulting 2 or 3 books (= main issue old + main issue new + one supplement) in the case of the NDCC proposal.
- This consideration favors the 2 years publication cycle.

- b. The separation between "old" and "new" will not be clear.

- (1) A blocked entry with 3 references in the years < 1969 and one reference of > 1970 will probably be included in the "new" part.
- (2) A blocked entry with all references in the years < 1969 and an Exfor index line of > 1970 will probably be included in the "old" part.
- (3) Unblocked references of an experiment made in the years around 1970 would appear partly in the "old" part, partly in the "new" part.
- (4) Important supplements and corrections to the "old" part would have to be included in the later issues of the "new" part.

These are not insuperable difficulties, but they would require some programming efforts. The two-years publication cycle would avoid them.

- c. The desire expressed in the NDCC proposal of separating "old" and "new" references is fulfilled, in a modified way, also in the two-years publication scheme, where the supplements issued over a two-years period will include mostly "new" literature. Of the "old" literature, the supplements will include only important supplements and corrections, exactly as in case b.(4) above.

Conclusion:

It appears that the 2-years publication cycle has some advantages to the users of Cinda and also to the Centers producing Cinda, although the differences to the NDCC proposal are actually small.