

Editor's Notes

Dear Colleagues,

I have recently received a few inquiries regarding publication/turnaround time. I would like to have around 6 weeks as the turnaround time, i.e., time between original submission, review, decision notification and receiving the final camera-ready version. Sometimes this is feasible but some, perhaps I should say most, times it is not. One non-trivial issue that hinders this is the so-called "reviewer fatigue." This is not a new issue, and unfortunately I see little that can be done to alleviate this in the short term. As a consequence sometimes I have a hard time finding a good reviewer for submitted papers, which obviously adds to the turnaround time. As well, since the *Record's* Associate Editors have their own material to handle it is left to me to find suitable reviewers, which sometimes requires some research from my side. I am considering adopting some policy that would require authors to suggest 2-4 names of suitable (and perhaps also of undesired) reviewers (subject to usual conflict of policy rules, of course). Let me also remind you that I must work with a page budget that also constrains when accepted papers will be actually published. In fact, in order to save some space I will break from the tradition of writing a sentence or two about the articles featured in the issues, a page here and there may eventually allow for an extra paper.

Along these lines, it may be also time for the *Record* to have a larger and broader set of policies in place. For instance, some of the columns should have some kind of policy, set in particular the columns on Event Reports and on Research Centers. Even whether some columns should be discontinued and/or others be introduced is a question not easy to answer. I am hoping to soon have some sort of online mechanism where you can provide some feedback regarding these topics. In the meantime I will maintain the current status-quo. Changes can be good but have to be well thought out before implemented. The *Record* is considered among the ACM SIGs to be a good quality, current and regularly published newsletter and it is very important to us all, the SIGMOD community, that we keep this reputation.

In summary, I am considering and discussing ideas which aim at improving and maintaining the quality of the papers published in the *Record*, and therefore of the *Record* itself, as well as assure timely dissemination. I hope to have a set of policies (or guidelines) published in the next edition. In the meantime, ideas from you, the readers and potential contributors, in the two main issues above will be most welcome.

Recently we have had a change in the list of Associate Editors. Amit Sheth, who served for quite some time as the Associate Editor for Research Centers has retired from that position. On behalf of SIGMOD's Executive Committee and past *Record* editors I want to extend our sincere thanks to Amit for his continuous help. To replace him I have invited Ugur Cetintemel from Brown University. I am confident he will continue Amit's good work. Welcome aboard Ugur!

When the printed issue reaches you we will probably have a new Chair, Vice-chair and Treasurer elected. I just want to take this chance to, on behalf of the Associate Editors and myself, thank the former officers, Tamer, Marianne, and Joachim for the opportunity they have given us, as well as for their guidance and help. Likewise, to the new officers, we offer our best wishes and our continuous help with the *Record*.

Mario Nascimento, Editor.
May 2005