**Editors’ report for the ASCS general meeting January 2015**

The editors of *Antichthon*, Han Baltussen and Art Pomeroy, report that volume 49 (2015) became electronically available to Libraries in December 2015 and to members of ASCS in January. Due to distribution hiccups, the hard copy version had not yet been distributed at the time of the meeting, but was expected within days. The volume, of 142 pages, included seven articles plus an appendix, four from Australasian contributors, and three from the northern hemisphere.

Although no articles for volume 50 are yet ready, there are a number of articles that have been returned for resubmission and others under review. It is planned that volume 51 will be a special issue based on the recent Auckland conference, ‘Politics and Power in the Early Roman Republic’.

*Antichthon’s* rejection rate was again high in 2015 (7/13). A number of papers were rejected because they did not reflect current scholarship on the issues or lacked a clear purpose. Although disappointing, this does reflect our status as a Cambridge journal, as does the process of resubmission with minor or major changes. We would like to acknowledge the help of the many readers who have assisted the editors in assessing the submissions and writing helpful reports.

The editors’ task is to invite submissions for *Antichthon*, to select referees, to make final decisions on the basis of the referees’ reports, to communicate with the authors during the period that leads up to acceptance or otherwise of the submission, and to follow the progress of paper that has been accepted through the proof stages. This has been an interesting year, given the change over to Cambridge as publisher. Decisions about design (e.g. the cover) and fonts have had to be made, but we believe these have improved the final appearance of the journal. The process was not dissimilar to that in the past (accepted articles going to Bruce Marshall, our production editor for initial copy editing, then to Cambridge, proofs to the contributors with corrections collated by the copy editor, then final proofs to the editors). It may be worth considering online publication as each article becomes available, as this will give time for correction if inadvertent errors occur in the proofing process. A complete debrief with Cambridge to assess how to handle the process most efficiently is desirable.

The change to Cambridge has involved effort, but the journal is now available more widely and better advertised by a major press.
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