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SUMMARY

The editorial process of Archivos de Zootecnia during 2011 is reported below. A total of 373 manuscripts were received from 31 countries, mainly from Brazil (77%). Consequently, the language most frequently used in the manuscripts was Portuguese, followed by Spanish and English. The mean time from submission to publication of a manuscript was 700.4 days shorter than the 836.3 days lasted during 2010. The rejection rate was 52.3%. In 2011, 104 articles, 60 short notes and 5 reviews (total 169) were published by authors coming from 23 countries.

INTRODUCTION

The shortening of excessively long editorial times, specially from submission to printing, detected in previous editorial reports, continued as the principal target for 2011. As the economic crisis has increased, the difficult are remaining, and so, to increase the number of pages published yearly is a hard task. Nevertheless, during 2011 an important effort was done and the number of published pages was more than twice of those in 2010.

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The editorial report of 2010 follows the same methodology described in the 2009 editorial report (Gómez Castro et al., 2010).

RECEIVED MANUSCRIPTS

Figure 1 shows the annual progress of manuscripts received since the creation of our web site (May, 2005). The annual number of manuscripts received and managed by Archivos de Zootecnia has remarkably increased ever since. The number of manuscripts received during 2011 was 373 (generally within the scope of the journal), of which: 300 were articles, 25 short notes, and 48 reviews. Both the number of manuscripts and their type were similar to 2010.

There have been no significant changes in the country of origin of the manuscripts; therefore, are substantially similar to contributions received in past recent years (table I). The 77% of manuscripts received come from Brazil, while Brazilian authors...
represent a greater proportion (81.99%), due to the greater number of authors of these manuscripts. These proportions are higher than in previous years, possibly related to a positive evaluation of Archivos de Zootecnia in Brasil. Manuscripts signed by Mexican and Nigerian authors represented an additional 9.3%, and the remaining 8.7%, came from other 28 countries, in proportions very similar (all lower than 2.0%). Manuscripts received are from 13 different Spanish speaking countries, two Lusophone countries and other 16 countries speaking different languages some (English, French and Italian) official in the magazine.

As shown in table II, the origin of the manuscripts is reflected on the language used. However the Portuguese represents 69.65%, which is lower than the percentage of items of Portuguese speaking origin. Spanish was used in 16.8% of the manuscripts with a significant decrease on the

| Ar | Ap | Nr | Np | Rr | Rp | Pr | Pp |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Albania | - | 0.33 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.20 |
| Algeria | 1.04 | - | 3.40 | 0.29 | - | - | 1.11 | 0.10 |
| Argentina | 2.09 | 7.41 | - | - | - | - | 1.74 | 4.57 |
| Austria | 0.12 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.10 | - |
| Belgium | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.41 |
| Brasil | 82.25 | 63.10 | 66.67 | 21.71 | 91.24 | 77.78 | 81.99 | 48.78 |
| Colombia | 0.52 | - | 1.36 | - | 1.03 | - | 0.63 | - |
| Costa Rica | 0.17 | - | 0.68 | - | 1.03 | - | 0.29 | - |
| Cuba | 0.70 | 3.62 | 2.04 | - | - | - | 0.73 | 2.24 |
| Chile | 0.58 | 0.66 | 2.04 | 0.29 | - | 3.70 | 0.63 | 0.61 |
| Dominicana R. | 0.12 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.10 | - |
| Egypt | 0.29 | 0.66 | - | - | - | - | 0.24 | 0.41 |
| France | 0.12 | 0.66 | - | - | - | - | 0.10 | 0.41 |
| Germany | 0.12 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.10 | - |
| Iran | 0.12 | - | 0.16 | - | - | - | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Italy | 0.12 | - | 0.16 | - | - | - | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Mexico | 6.09 | 5.44 | 16.33 | 5.14 | 2.06 | - | 6.44 | 5.18 |
| Nigeria | 3.19 | 4.94 | 2.72 | 4.86 | - | - | 2.86 | 4.78 |
| Panama | - | 0.16 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.10 |
| Paraguay | 0.06 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.05 | - |
| Peru | 0.35 | - | - | 1.43 | - | - | 0.29 | 0.51 |
| Portugal | 0.17 | - | - | 0.57 | - | - | 0.15 | 0.20 |
| South Africa | 0.06 | 0.16 | - | - | - | - | 0.05 | 0.10 |
| South Korea | - | 0.33 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.20 |
| Spain | 0.93 | 7.74 | 3.40 | 61.71 | 4.64 | 18.52 | 1.45 | 27.24 |
| Switzerland | - | 0.16 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.10 |
| Togo | - | - | - | 0.29 | - | - | - | 0.10 |
| Tunez | 0.17 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.15 | - |
| Uruguay | 0.12 | 2.47 | 1.36 | 2.57 | - | - | 0.19 | 2.44 |
| USA | 0.29 | 0.66 | - | - | - | - | 0.24 | 0.41 |
| Venezuela | 0.23 | 0.99 | - | - | - | - | 0.19 | 0.61 |

A: articles; N: short notes; R: reviews; P: total papers; r: received; p: published.

Table I. Origin (%) of authors of manuscripts received and published during 2011. (Origen (%) de los autores de los manuscritos recibidos y publicados durante 2011).
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former 25.4%; and English was the language used in 12.74%, similar to the previous year. Only very few of manuscripts received (0.81%) were written in French. As in previous years, there were no articles in Italian. It is remarkable that the percentage of manuscripts published in Spanish is higher than those received, while the trend is reversed in the manuscripts published in Portuguese.

**REVIEWING**

Each manuscript submitted to Archivos de Zootecnia is first reviewed by members of the Editorial Board and Advisory Council. Subsequently, the Editorial Board at its plenary session, analyzes each submitted manuscript and decide if it must be reviewed (in which case at least two, and up to four reviewers, are assigned) or rejected. Reviewers are chosen from a repertoire of nearly 1000 reputed international experts from many different countries.

Archivos de Zootecnia is grateful to the 313 experts to whom at least one manuscript was sent to for review during 2011, as

![Graph](image)

**Figure 1.** Annual progress of manuscripts received since May 2005. (Evolución de los manuscritos recibidos desde mayo de 2005).

**Table II.** Language used (%) in the manuscripts received and published during 2011. (Idioma empleado (%) en los manuscritos recibidos y publicados durante 2011).

|        | Ar | Ap  | Nr  | Np  | Rr  | Rp  | Pr  | Pp  |
|--------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| English| 14.43 | 20.19 | 8.33 | 13.33 | 4.26 |   -  | 12.74 | 17.16 |
| French | 1.01 |    - |     - | 3.33 |    - |  -  |  0.81 | 1.18 |
| Italian|    - |      - |     - |    - |     - |  -  |     - |     - |
| Portuguese| 68.12 | 52.88 | 58.33 | 21.67 | 85.11 | 80.00 | 69.65 | 42.60 |
| Spanish | 16.44 | 26.92 | 33.33 | 61.67 | 10.64 | 20.00 | 16.80 | 39.05 |

A: articles; N: short notes; R: reviews; P: total papers; r: received; p: published.
indicated in annex 1. As shown in table III, the average review time of 160.2 ± 149.4 was longer than previous years. However, the time from acceptance to publication changed from 629.9 ± 31.8 in 2010 to 448.5 ± 31.8 days in 2011, first consequence of the duplication of the annual number of pages. Consequently, the time between submission of a manuscript and its publication has decreased to 700.4 ± 309.2 days vs. 836.3 ± 31.1 in 2010. These waiting times continue too high and, although causes for this are attributed to all stages, frequently the authors themselves caused large delays during the correction of their manuscripts. As the page number was strongly increased the number of waiting manuscripts was reduced near to 0.

A more detailed analysis of these data shows that the management of the reviews and feedback from reviewers was longer than in previous year, the recuperation of delayed manuscripts is the principal reason, however, there is still a lot of work to do for minimize delays. In past years the delays were growing during the publication phase due to the large number of manuscripts received and approved, which far exceeds the maximum number of pages published yearly due to budgetary reasons. Nevertheless, along 2011 a considerable effort was done and the number of pages (and so, of manuscripts) have been duplicated.

The acceptance and rejection rate of manuscripts received, and completed, in 2011 reached 2.9% and 52.3% respectively. While the acceptance rate has decreased compared to previous years, the rejection has increased. The sum of these rates does not imply that only 44.8% of the manuscripts received during 2011 are pending a decision, since in fact there are more manuscripts in revision received during the precedent year.

PUBLISHED PAPERS

The journal Archivos de Zootecnia published 171 manuscripts during 2011 (table IV), doubling the number of manuscripts published in 2010. The manuscripts were published mainly in Portuguese (42.6%) and Spanish (39.0%); however, manuscripts published in Portuguese decreased, while the manuscripts published in Spanish increased in 2011 (table II). About 48.8% of the authors were Brazilians followed by Spanish (27.2%) authors and finally, the remaining authors are from other 21 countries (table I). Countries of origin of authors continue the trend of recent years. The average number of authors in 2011 was 5.8 ± 2.5/manuscript. The average length of articles was 9.7 ± 1.7 pages, 4.0 ± 0.1 pages for short notes, and 15.0 ± 6.2 pages for reviews.

| Table III. Editorial timing during 2011 (mean ± typical deviation). (Tiempo editorial en 2011 (media ± desviación típica).) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
| reception-decision | acceptance-publication | reception-publication |
| Articles           | 179.7 ± 161.5          | 520.1 ± 14.7          | 42.8 ± 211.6          |
| Short notes        | 119.5 ± 107.9          | 359.1 ± 284.7         | 83.0 ± 313.8          |
| Reviews            | 111.0 ± 103.4          | 30.8 ± 14.7           | 347.4 ± 134.7         |
| Total              | 160.2 ± 149.4          | 448.5 ± 31.8          | 00.4 ± 309.2          |

| Table IV. Manuscripts published in 2011. (Trabajos publicados en 2011). |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
| N        | %       | Pages | %    |
| Articles | 104     | 60.8  | 1012 | 75.7 |
| Short notes | 60     | 35.1  | 239  | 17.9 |
| Reviews  | 5       | 2.9   | 75   | 5.6  |
| News     | 1       | 0.6   | 2    | 0.1  |
| Editorial report | 1     | 0.6   | 8    | 0.6  |
| Total    | 171     | 100   | 1336 | 100  |
About 7% of the received manuscripts are written by authors coming from more than one country, in the case of published papers this figure rises to 11.2%. Members of the Publisher Institution or from Editorial Board in the previous year only accounted for 0.8 and 0.1 percent respectively, in 2011 rose to 1.6 and 2.3% respectively. In any case, in the previous and present year, are small ratios of endogamy in the contents of the journal (table V).

The topics covered in the manuscripts published by Archivos de Zootecnia are shown in table VI. The animal species

**Table V. Manuscripts (%) authored by members of the University of Cordoba or by members of the Editorial staff published in 2011.** (Trabajos (%) firmados por miembros de la Universidad de Córdoba o del Equipo Editorial durante 2011).

|                  | University of Cordoba | Editorial staff |
|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Articles         | 1.3                    | 2.1             |
| Short notes      | 0.9                    | 2.0             |
| Reviews          | 18.5                   | 11.1            |
| Total            | 1.6                    | 2.3             |

**Table VI. Topics covered in manuscripts received and published during 2011.** (Temas tratados en los manuscritos recibidos y publicados durante 2011).

| Ar | Ap | Nr | Np | Rr | Rp | Pr | Pp |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Animal behavior | 1.00 | 0.96 | - | 1.67 | - | - | 0.81 | 1.18 |
| Breeds and genetic | 7.02 | 16.35 | 4.00 | 40.00 | 2.13 | - | 6.20 | 24.26 |
| Economy and management | 3.68 | 6.73 | - | 6.67 | - | - | 2.96 | 6.51 |
| Environment | 0.33 | - | - | 2.13 | - | - | 0.54 | - |
| Farming systems | 2.68 | 2.88 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 2.13 | 20.00 | 2.70 | 4.14 |
| Feeding and foods | 59.87 | 60.58 | 44.00 | 11.67 | 51.06 | 40.00 | 57.68 | 42.60 |
| Growth | 1.67 | 0.96 | 4.00 | 6.67 | 2.13 | - | 1.89 | 2.96 |
| Health | - | 1.92 | 16.00 | - | 17.02 | - | 3.23 | 1.18 |
| Production techniques | 7.36 | 8.65 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 12.77 | 40.00 | 7.82 | 8.28 |
| Productive activity |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| all ruminants | 3.34 | - | - | - | 12.77 | 40.00 | 4.31 | 1.18 |
| alternative species | 3.68 | 6.73 | 8.00 | 11.67 | - | - | 3.50 | 8.28 |
| aquaculture | 7.69 | 6.73 | 4.00 | 1.67 | 6.38 | - | 7.28 | 4.73 |
| beekeeping | 0.67 | 0.96 | - | 1.67 | - | - | 0.54 | 1.18 |
| bovines | 27.09 | 26.92 | 12.00 | 41.67 | 27.66 | - | 26.15 | 31.36 |
| caprines | 4.35 | 5.77 | 12.00 | 6.67 | - | - | 4.31 | 5.92 |
| equines | 1.34 | 2.88 | - | 10.00 | 2.13 | - | 1.35 | 5.33 |
| ovines | 12.04 | 10.58 | 40.00 | 13.33 | 2.13 | - | 12.67 | 11.24 |
| porcines | 9.70 | 7.69 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 10.64 | - | 9.43 | 6.51 |
| poultry | 9.70 | 9.62 | - | 6.67 | 8.51 | 40.00 | 8.89 | 9.47 |
| rabbits | 5.69 | 1.92 | - | - | - | - | 4.58 | 1.18 |
| Products |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| carcass and meat | 0.67 | 5.77 | 8.00 | 13.33 | 55.32 | - | 8.09 | 8.28 |
| eggs | 2.68 | - | - | - | 2.13 | - | 2.43 | - |
| honey | 0.33 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.27 | - |
| milk | 2.01 | 0.96 | - | 1.67 | - | - | 1.62 | 1.18 |
| cheese | - | 0.96 | - | - | - | - | 0.59 | - |
| Reproduction | 9.03 | 10.58 | 32.00 | 26.67 | 6.38 | - | 10.24 | 15.98 |

A: articles; N: short notes; R: reviews; P: total papers; r: received; p: published.
studied were mainly, bovine, followed by ovine, poultry and alternative species. The studies mainly focused on feeding and foods, breeds and genetics, and reproduction. Topics continue the trend of recent years.

DIFUSSION
Archivos de Zootecnia (online and paper editions) is included in about 400 directories or electronic databases (Agricultural BIOSIS, CAB abstracts, Latinindex, Scopus, Scielo ...), making the journal readily found. No notable changes from the previous year in this regard. More than 2 300 000 (400 000 hits during 2011) visits have been registered in Archivos de Zootecnia web page:
http://www.uco.es/organiza/servicios/publica/az/az.htm

In conclusion, during 2011 Archivos de Zootecnia has reinforced its role as an outlet for scientific research regardless of the long editorial times. The problems detected in previous reports regarding the delay in publication have decreased; however, it is not enough, nevertheless the efforts done by Archivos de Zootecnia during 2011.
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ANNEX 1. 2011 REFEREES
Argentina: A. Guglielmone; A. Ohanian; D. Bedotti; D. Rochinotti; E. Morici; G. Gagliostro; J.C. Gómez; J.I. Arroquy; J.O. Azcona; J.P. Roux; J.R. Carrete; L. Romero; M. Benvenutti; M. Brizuela; M. de León; N. Aguilar; R. Martinez; O.M. González; P. Maldonado. Vargas.
Austria: M. Schuh.
Brasil: A. Aparecido; A. Borges Amorim; A. da Silva Marante; A. de Moura Zanine; A. Eiko Murakami; A. Evangelista; A. Ferreira Barcelos; A. Ferriani Branco; A.G.G.C. Alves; A.J. Vieira Pires; A.L. Costa Cruz Borges; A.L. Finkler da Silveira; A.M. Corrêa Vieira; A.M. Vieira Batista; A. Martins Varela de Arruda; A. Moreira Ramos de Carvalho; A. Nunez de Madeiro; A.S. Chaves Veras; A. Sanpaio Carrijo; A. Saras Netto; A. Silva Madeiro; A. Silva; A. Soares Oliveira; A.E. Santana; B. Borges Demínicios; B. Murta Salomão; B.R. Cunha dos Santos; C. Abdalla Gomide; C. Bressan; C. Cachoni Pizzolante; C. Kiefer; C. Leaf; C. Mistura; C. Scapinello; C. Thomaz; C.C. H.M. Malhado; D.A. Berto; D. Emygdio de Faria; D. Façanha; D. Jorge de Moura; D. Matos; D. Sávio Campos Paciullo; D. Soares da Silva; E. Oliveira Simões Saliba; E. Cavalcanti Pimenta Filho; E.M. Casartelli; E.R. Moraes Garcia; E. Shimoda; E. Tadeu Fialho; E. Vasconcelos Ho-
landa Júnior; F.F. Ramos de Carvalho; F. Istvan Bankuti; F. Meurer; F. Nogueira Domingues; G. Giordano Pinto de Carvalho; G. Guerreiro; G.L. Colnago; G. Medeiros; G. Porto Barreto; G. Sampaio Gonçalves; H. Borba; H. Mazzucco; H. Oliveira Silva; H. Pandorfi; H. Pena Couto; I. Borges; I.J. da Silva; I. Zanella; J. Ribamar Marques; J.C. Batista Dubeux; J. Daros Malaquias Júnior; J.N. Miranda Neiva; J. Pereira Neves; J.R. Olaquiagua Pérez; J. Ribamar Privado Filho; J. Souza; J.A. Delfino Barbosa Filho; L.A. Kioshi Aoki Inoue; L.A. Nero; L.C. Cassol; L. da Silva Cabral; L.E. Edivaldo Pezzato; L.G. Nussio; L.G. Tavares Braga; L. Galvao Alburquerque; L. Geraseev; L.M. Zeoula; L. Paes Barreto; L. Rei de França; L.G.T. Braga; M.A. Cassiano Lara; M.A. Rotta; M.C. Carvalho Guimarães; M.C. Silva; M.C. Soares Fioravanti; M.C. Thomaz; M. de Andrade Ferreira; M.G. Morais; M.I. Marcondes; M.J. de Oliveira Almeida; M.J. Duarte; M.L. Nicodemo; M.L. Pires Bianchi; M.L. Rodrigues de Souza; M.M. Machado Ribeiro Azevêdo; M. Miele; M.N. Ribeiro; M. Pacheco Chediak Correa; M. Pereira da Silva; M.R. de Borba; M.S. da Rosa; M. Toledo; M. Vazquez Vidal Júnior; M. Verardino de Stéfani; M.F. Mota; N. Rocha Silva; N.M. Rodríguez; O. Cavalcanti; O. Gomes Pereira; O.M. de Moura; P.A. Victória.
de Oliveira; P.B. Ferraz Filho; P.C. de Aguiar Paiva; P. Marques Meyer; P.P. Mendonça; R. A. C. Correa Filho; R.A. Cardellino; R. Allan Bombardelli; R. Carrilho Canesin; R. Casarotto; R. de Oliveira Figueiredo; R. Germano; R.L. Marchão; R.M. Brito; R. Menezes; R. Oliveira Cavalli; R. Pavesi Araujo; R.A. Reis; S.A. do Carmo Araújo; S. Benone; S. Endo; S.L. Salomón Cabral Filho; S.M. Franciscato Cozzolino; S.M. Salis; S. Raposo de Medeiros; T.C. Ribeiro Dias Koberstein; T. Domiciano Dantas Martis; T. Vasconcelos Melo; V. Fischer; V. Imbrossi Teixeira; V. Joana Pott; V. Rodrigues Vasconcelos; V.F.B. Roll; W. Massamitu Furuya; W. Motta Ferreira; W.R. Boscolo. 

Canadá: E. Martín Aregheore; M. Juarez. Chile: P. Toro Mujica; J. Piñeira; C. Aguilar. 

España: A. Arana; A. Diz Plaza; A. Calleja Suárez; A. Arguello Henríquez; A. Estevez; A.F. Chica Pérez; A. Francesch Vidal; A. González Martínez; A. González; A. Horcada Ibáñez; A.I. Garzón Sigler; V. Rodríguez-Estévez; V. Fernández-Cabanas; T.J. Roy Pérez; R. Moyano Salgado; R.M. Nieto; R. Ginés; R. Dios Palomares; R. Celaya; R. Caballero; R. Blanco Sepúlveda; R. Acero de la Cruz; P. Zurita; P. Lara Velez; P. Alberti Lasalle; N. Nuñez Sanchez; M. Valera Córdoba; M. Sánchez Rodríguez; M.P. Ruiz Pérez-Cacho; M. P. Pérez Guzmán Palomares; M. Joy; M. Jover Cerda; M. Jodral Villarejo; M.J. Milán; M.J. López Asensio; M.J. Alcalde Aldeia; M. Hidalgo Prieto; M. Hermoso; M. Gómez Fernández; M. Fondevila Camps; M. Fernández; M.A. Chaso Criado; L. Pérez; L.F. Gosálvez Lara; L. Bermejo; L. Alabart; J.C. Navarro; J. Tovar Andrade; J. Santiago Moreno; J. Martos Peinado; J. Madrid Sánchez; J.M. Serrano Caballero; J.M. Mancilla Leytón; J. M. León Jurado; J.M. Castel Genis; J.L. Vega Plà; J.L. Ares; J. Jordana Vidal; J.J. Garrido; J. García García; J. Folch Pera; J.F. Pérez Hernández; J.F. Aguilera Sánchez; J. Durado; J. Capote; J. Cañón Ferreras; J. Balcells; J.A. Cebrian Pérez; I. Vázquez González; I. Berriuaga; I. Abdel Gálvez; H. GalánSoldevilla; G. Santoma; F. Ruiz de Huidobro; A. de Villapadierna; F.J. Berral de la Rosa; E. Gómez Blasco; E. Camacho Vallejo; E. Berriatúa; D. Sola-Oriol; D. Carrión Pardo; C. Vieira Ailler; C. Sosa; C. Saludro Astiz; C. Cervera Fras; C. Barba Capote; A. Titos Moreno; A. Sanz Rus; A. Rodríguez de Ledesma; A. Poto Remacha; A. Olazola; A. Méndez Sánchez; A. Martínez Teruel; A. Martínez Martínez; A. Martínez Fernández; P. García Herradon; M.R. Fresno Vaquero; A.M. Serrano González; A.L. Martínez Marín; C. García Romero; M. Fondevila Camps; J. Durado; P. Peñalver; R. Ginés. 

Francia: P. Sans; M. Meuret. 

Italia: V. Landi; S. Gigli; E. Lasagna. 

México: M. Meneses-Mayo; M. González Alcorta; M.G. Rodríguez Galván; M.A. Galina Hidalgo; J. Quiroz Valiente; A. Diaz Cruz; A. Cesín Vargas; G. Mascorro; F.J.V. Franco Guerra. 

Nigeria: A.O. Oni; S.N. Ukachukwu. 

Panamá: A. Villalobos. 

Paraguay: A. Yanosky Farrán. 

República Dominicana: D. Valerio Cabrera. 

USA: J. Coelho; R. Adedayo Hamzat. 

Uruguay: C. Mas; F. Olmos; W. Ayala; Y. Acosta. 

Venezuela: V. De Basilio; Z. Chirinos.