Letter From the Editors

It’s our 17th year!

Let me extend the wishes of the editors and reviewers to the authors and readers for a very happy, healthy, and productive 2001.

There will be few changes in Immunohematology in 2001. It has been decided to publish the Instructions for Authors in every issue for the convenience of our authors. This change started with the last issue in 2000.

Both subscribers and casual reviewers are using the Immunohematology Web site. It is a very comprehensive site and all information in the printed issue can be accessed on the Web site. In addition, you can send a letter to the editor, send an article, subscribe on a secure site, and do a literature search by word or words.

For those readers who remember the “good old days,” Immunohematology is looking for interesting remembrances from the earlier days of blood banking for the column, “Those were the Days.” I know that there are many stories probably told and retold daily that would be interesting and insightful for our readers.

The biggest problem and one that is experienced by many journals is the lack of articles. It is the policy of Immunohematology to publish articles concerning blood group serology, education, and computer technology. This includes articles on red cell, white cell, and platelet serology. There is a concerted effort by other journals to publish the same types of articles; therefore, the competition is becoming intense. When you have an interesting subject, you should write the article, and we hope you will consider Immunohematology as the journal of choice.

The editors of Immunohematology would like the 17th year of publication to be one of many more, not the last!

Delores Mallory
Editor-in-Chief

Mary McGinniss
Managing Editor
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Letter to the Editors: Re: Gel Technology for RbIG dosage

We regret the misspelling of Dr. Stephen Apfelroth’s last name on the Contents page and following the letter submitted by him for publication under Communications. In addition, the last sentence of Dr. Apfelroth’s letter should read “It should also be noted that the AABB Technical Manual gives 30 mL of fetal whole blood volume as the recommended amount for coverage by 300 μg of RbIG as opposed to 20 mL as used by the authors.”