

## An Edit Too Far

Author: Beardsley, Timothy M.

Source: BioScience, 63(5) : 315

Published By: American Institute of Biological Sciences

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2013.63.5.1>

---

BioOne Complete ([complete.BioOne.org](http://complete.BioOne.org)) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at [www.bioone.org/terms-of-use](http://www.bioone.org/terms-of-use).

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

---

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

**PUBLISHER**  
Richard T. O'Grady

**EDITOR IN CHIEF**  
Timothy M. Beardsley

**MANAGING EDITOR**  
James M. Verdier

**BOOK REVIEW EDITOR**  
**PEER REVIEW / PRODUCTION COORDINATION**  
Jennifer A. Williams

**MANUSCRIPT EDITOR**  
Nathan N. True

**Editors:** Eye on Education: Beth Baker (educationoffice@aibs.org); Feature articles: Beth Baker (features@aibs.org); Washington Watch: Robert E. Gropp (publicpolicy@aibs.org).

**Editorial Board:** Rick Bonney, Gordon Brown, Richard M. Burian, Catherine E. Carr, Joseph Cloud, Scott Collins, Rita R. Colwell, Charlene D'Avanzo, Kathleen Donohue, David L. Evans, Cassandra G. Extavour, Eric A. Fischer, Kirk Fitzhugh, Nick Haddad, Geoffrey M. Henebry, Cynthia S. Jones, Linda A. Joyce, Edna S. Kaneshiro, David M. Leslie Jr., Harvey B. Lillywhite, Alan C. Love, Paula Mabree, Marshall A. Martin, Janice Moore, Peter B. Moyle, Ben Pierce, Jason Podrabsky, J. Michael Scott, Daniel Simberloff, Martin Tracey, Monica Turner, Randy Wayne, Judith S. Weis, David S. Wilcove, Jean A. Wyld.

**BioScience** (ISSN 0006-3568; e-ISSN 1525-3244) is published 12 times a year by the American Institute of Biological Sciences, 1900 Campus Commons Dr., Suite 200, Reston, VA 20191, in collaboration with the University of California Press. Periodicals postage paid at Berkeley, CA, and additional mailing offices. **POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to *BioScience*, University of California Press, Journals and Digital Publishing, 2000 Center Street, Suite 303, Berkeley, CA 94704-1223, or e-mail customerservice@ucpressjournals.com.

**Membership and subscription:** Individual members, go to [www.aibs.org/aibs-membership/index.html](http://www.aibs.org/aibs-membership/index.html) for benefits and services, membership rates, and back issue claims. Subscription renewal month is shown in the four-digit year-month code in the upper right corner of the mailing label. Institutional subscribers, go to [www.ucpressjournals.com](http://www.ucpressjournals.com) or e-mail customerservice@ucpressjournals.com. Out-of-print issues and volumes are available from Periodicals Service Company, 11 Main Street, Germantown, NY 12526-5635; telephone: 518-537-4700; fax: 518-537-5899; Web site: [www.periodicals.com](http://www.periodicals.com).

**Advertising:** For information about display and online advertisements and deadlines, e-mail adsales@ucpressjournals.com. For information about classified placements and deadlines, contact Jennifer A. Williams, AIBS (jwilliams@aibs.org).

**Copying and permissions notice:** Authorization to copy article content beyond fair use (as specified in sections 107 and 108 of the US Copyright Law) for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by the Regents of the University of California on behalf of AIBS for libraries and other users, provided that they are registered with and pay the specified fee through the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC), [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com). To reach the CCC's Customer Service Department, call 978-750-8400 or e-mail [info@copyright.com](mailto:info@copyright.com). For permission to distribute electronically, republish, resell, or repurpose material, use the CCC's Rightslink service on JSTOR at <http://www.jstor.org/tr/ucal/bio>. Submit all other permissions and licensing inquiries through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions Web site, [www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintInfo.asp](http://www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintInfo.asp), or e-mail [journalspermissions@ucpress.edu](mailto:journalspermissions@ucpress.edu).

**Abstracting and indexing:** For complete abstracting and indexing information, please visit [www.ucpressjournals.com](http://www.ucpressjournals.com).  
© 2013 American Institute of Biological Sciences. All rights reserved. Printed by The Sheridan Press.

# BioScience®

**A Forum for Integrating the Life Sciences**  
American Institute of Biological Sciences

## An Edit Too Far

The article on the overlooked terrestrial impacts of mountaintop mining that appears on p. 335 of this issue provides a valuable overview of research on this destructive and polluting practice. The authors, James Wickham of the US Environmental Protection Agency's National Exposure Research Laboratory, Petra Bohall Wood of the US Geological Survey's (USGS) West Virginia Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, and eight others, draw attention to the dearth of research on terrestrial—as distinct from aquatic—effects of this mining technique. But readers of the article should know that, after it went through peer review, revision, approval by a *BioScience* editorial board member, formal acceptance, editing by *BioScience* staff, and approval of the edits by the authors, Wickham and Wood wrote *BioScience* to say that the USGS required a change before the article could be published.

The change that the USGS required was small, but it is worth describing. The authors had written in their discussion section that “Reliance on the framework established by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the law that established the requirement for an environmental assessment or an EIS [environmental impact statement] for actions proposed by US federal agencies that have the potential to affect the natural environment (CEQ 2007), seems to be appropriate for addressing the potential terrestrial impacts of mountaintop mining.” That judgment was too much for the USGS: In the published version of the article, “seems to be appropriate” in the quoted sentence has been changed to “could be an appropriate option.” The justification for the late change was a statement included in the (peer-reviewed, revised) version of the manuscript that it was “not yet approved for publication by the US Geological Survey.” The inclusion of that statement in submitted articles, which gives the agency the right to demand post-peer-review changes such as this one, represents a change in the USGS's practice: The statement has not appeared on other manuscripts submitted by USGS authors.

The edit is irrelevant to scientific integrity, some might argue, since it affects a judgment about policy, rather than a strictly scientific conclusion. If the USGS had required censorship of or a change to a scientific conclusion, *BioScience* would not have published the article: AIBS has long championed scientific integrity policies at scientific federal agencies (see, e.g., [www.aibs.org/position-statements/20100929\\_interior\\_scientific\\_integrity.html](http://www.aibs.org/position-statements/20100929_interior_scientific_integrity.html)). In any case, according to one school of thought, policy preferences should not be expressed in scientific articles. On that view, we should thank the USGS for saving us from laxity.

Yet, it is hard for authors to discuss policies without revealing more or less directly which ones they favor (and most people would not want to read articles that revealed no such judgments). So, from an academic and editorial perspective, it is problematic for agencies to require the option of making changes after peer review. Some cases may be more difficult than this one to adjudicate. The policy says, in effect, that the agency does not trust its own scientists to maintain the integrity of a manuscript after submission. *BioScience* reserves the option to disallow any changes requested after a manuscript has been accepted, as it always has. Moreover, *BioScience* will in the future not accept revised manuscripts marked as subject to subsequent agency review.

TIMOTHY M. BEARDSLEY  
Editor in Chief

doi:10.1525/bio.2013.63.5.1