

2016

Omission: NABB Oct Dec 2015 Vol 40 no 4 and Jan Mar Vol 41 no 1, page 19

North American Bird Bander

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/nabb>

Recommended Citation

North American Bird Bander (2016) "Omission: NABB Oct Dec 2015 Vol 40 no 4 and Jan Mar Vol 41 no 1, page 19," *North American Bird Bander*. Vol. 41 : Iss. 3 , Article 4.
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/nabb/vol41/iss3/4>

This News Notes is brought to you for free and open access by the Searchable Ornithological Research Archive at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in North American Bird Bander by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

News, Notes, Comments

Omission: *NABB* Oct. Dec 2015 Vol.40 No.4 & Jan.- Mar. Vol. 41 No.1 - page 19, Lesser Goldfinch: New Longevity Record article, the author's name was left off. The author's name and address should have been noted as follows:

Holly M. Garrod
31546 Broadmoor Dr.
Evergreen, CO 80439

The *NABB* editorial board apologizes for this omission.

WHITHER NORTH AMERICAN BIRD BANDER: ADDITIONAL IDEAS

In the April-June 2015 issue of *North American Bird Bander* (*NABB*) (Vol. 40(2):69-70) C. J. Ralph summarized some of the 'facts of life' facing publications in the field of ornithology and *NABB* in particular. His suggestions are cogent and should be reviewed carefully and, wherever possible, implemented. Although I can not quite match his record of being a bander for 60 years (only 54 in my case), I was very much involved with the sometimes acrimonious 'Great Journal Joining' which is to say, the merger of the three regional banding association newsletters to form *NABB*. Accordingly, I am concerned that now, after 40 productive years, steps be taken to insure the continuation of *NABB*'s role in the dissemination of useful information to the field of ornithology in North America and perhaps beyond.

I fully concur with Ralph's suggestion that raising *NABB*'s profile and gaining a better "impact factor" value will attract additional authors, readership, and association memberships. In the past, a journal's impact factor was never a consideration for me as to where I submitted a manuscript. However, today it is a new age and a journal's impact factor is a valid consideration for authors, particularly new ones, when making submissions. In his article, Ralph also pointed out that *NABB* is "an excellent 'go to' journal for banding-related science and methods." I agree: emphasis on methods! I have two suggestions as to how *NABB*'s present role can be built up a bit more in our quest for an improved impact factor score and hopefully a brighter future for *NABB*.

In the past there has also been a partial gap between the

more academic researchers looking to back up more theoretical constructs with hard field data and those active banders summarizing data they have collected on topics such as age-sex determination, migration and survival rates to name a few. The few times we have had a joint scientific meeting between a banding association and a research organization, such as the Cooper Ornithological Society, there was very valuable exchange of information between those wishing to learn how to capture and band birds for their research and those who already have the expertise to do so but could use some mentoring in the ways of data summarization and analysis.

To some extent, the methods section of published papers should be explicit enough for another researcher to replicate the study. With today's costs of publication, editors are unlikely to allow an extensively enlarged methods section in a submitted manuscript. All too often generalized statements such as "birds were captured with mist nets" or "birds were marked for later recognition with colored plastic bands" are all that can be included. No details are likely to be given about how and where the nets were set, or what went into the choice of the type of color bands or other marking devices that were used. More importantly, no information is apt to be included, or which techniques were not utilized and why. Other workers should not have to go through this trial-and-error 'rediscovery of the wheel' process. What works for one species and not for another should be spelled out. Here is a role for *NABB*. Authors, particularly early in their careers, could elaborate on the development of their field techniques, explaining what worked and also what did not. This summary could then be cited in the abbreviated methods section of their more data-oriented manuscript or manuscripts (presumably in one of those "High Impact Factor" journals). I advocated this approach many years ago and two papers of exactly this sort were submitted and published in *NABB*. One dealt with catching elusive Roadrunners (Vehrencamp and Halpenny 1981) and one with secretive Clapper Rails (Zemba and Massey 1983). I am sure there are others. I think this is an approach which is both useful to ornithologists conducting field studies of birds or, particularly, those contemplating starting such. It goes without saying that *NABB* is a ready-made outlet for this type of manuscript to supplement its current coverage.