## Numbering System for Moon Samples

Numbers are assigned to the lunar samples in the Lunar Receiving Laboratory (LRL) as soon as the samples have been photographed. The numbers have two parts: the generic, or first part, and the specific, or second part. The generic number is a 5-digit number assigned to each discrete piece as it is received; it remains with all portions of that piece. The generic numbers for Apollo 11 rocks are all in the 10thousand series; those for Apollo 12 are in the 12-thousand series.

The specific number is a sequentially assigned integer used primarily for bookkeeping and is essentially the number used to designate a piece or fraction of the original sample. It is essentially a sample split number. Thus, if the piece labeled 10017,14 were cut into three pieces, the new pieces might be labeled 10017,72; 10017,73; and 10017,74 if these were the next unassigned numbers. Number 10017,14 would no longer be assigned to a piece, and the records would indicate that the piece was cut into smaller pieces.

The investigators who have received lunar material have used their own nomenclature for subsplits, producing a three-part number. The third part is the identification assigned by a particular investigator. The third part of the number is attached to the LRL number by any convenient punctuation. Some investigators have used dashes, others have used commas, slashes, or periods. In papers in this issue, some authors have omitted the first three digits of the generic number. Thus, an investigator working with a subsplit of 10017,72 may have designated it 10017,72-1 and may refer to it as 17,7201 or 17,72/1, or simply as 72-1. When the samples are returned to the Lunar Receiving Laboratory, new specific numbers will be assigned to the subsplits, yielding two-part numbers again.

In addition to specific numbers, samples are also identified by letters that indicate the type of material. Type A is fine-grained vesicular crystalline igneous rock; type B, medium-grained vuggy crystalline rock; type C, breccia; and type D, fines.

DANIEL H. ANDERSON Curator, Manned Spacecraft Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Houston, Texas

Publication of this issue of *Science* was accomplished with the help of many persons who are not members of the editorial staff. Wilmot Hess was instrumental in developing the broad outlines of the publication procedures that were ultimately adopted for the Apollo 11 Lunar Science Conference by NASA. After his departure from NASA, Gene Simmons and Anthony J. Calio helped complete the detailed arrangements.

The publication plan developed by the Science staff within this framework called for reviewing, editing, and revision of papers during the period of the conference. The results of the effort are shown in Table 1. Refereeing was accomplished by a group of 50 conference participants, who provided more than 250 reviews in less than 4 days. Authors whose papers required revision were called in to discuss the revisions with the referee; revisions were completed before the end of the conference. Reviewing was facilitated by the work of six reviewers who also served as topic chairmen: Stanley Hart and George R. Tilton, geochronology and geochemistry; Ian MacGregor and David Wones, mineralogy and petrology; David Strangway, physical properties; and Thomas Hoering, organic geochemistry. The chairmen enlisted additional reviewers, who were invited to look over the manuscripts grouped on a table by sub-

## Acknowledgments

ject and take their pick. These additional reviewers were John B. Adams, Edward Anders, Orson Anderson, James A. Arnold, Gustaf Arrhenius, Elso Barghoorn, Peter M. Bell, Francis R. Boyd, Malcolm Campbell, Preston Cloud, Alvin J. Cohen, Herbert Diamond, Geoffrey Eglinton, Samuel Epstein, Larry W. Finger, Kurt Fredriksson, Clifford Frondel, G. F. J. Garlick, Paul Gast, J. E. Geake, Gordon Goles, Stefan Hafner, Stephen Haggerty, Larry A. Haskin, C. E. Helsley, H. Kanamori, Donald H. Lindsley, Warren Meinschein, Arnulf Muan, John A. O'Keefe, Robert O. Pepin, Dean Presnall, K. A. Richardson, James M. Schopf, S. Fred Singer, Joseph V. Smith, D. Tozer, Robert M. Walker, Louis S. Walter, G. J. Wasserburg, G. W. Wetherill, M. T. Yates, and Leonard P. Zill.

All papers submitted were screened for editorial problems during the conference, and editing was completed on a third of them. Authors were invited to examine the edited manuscripts and make changes if they wished to do so before the end of the conference.

Eleven members of the editorial staff worked in Houston. They were joined

Table 1. Dates of start and finish of each step in the publication of the Apollo 11 Lunar Science Conference issue of *Science*.

Step	Dates
Receipt of manuscripts from authors	4– 7 January
Reviewing of manuscripts	4– 8 January
Authors' responses to reviews	5– 8 January
Style editing and marking for printer	5–12 January
Redrafting and relettering illustrations	5–12 January
Authors' responses to style editing	5–23 January
Preparation of engravings	8–22 January
Typesetting	9–19 January
Proofreading of galley proofs	10–19 January
Pasteup of page dummies	13–20 January
Correction of galleys and makeup of pages	13–21 January
Proofreading of page proofs	17–24 January
Correction of pages	20–26 January
Proofreading of revised page proofs	21–27 January
Printing	23–28 January
Binding	28–30 January
Mailing	28–31 January