

# Our challenge: Adaptive management of *JEM*

---

**Julie Schooling, *JEM* Managing Editor**

**I**s *JEM* relevant and readable? Is it easily accessible? Is it innovative yet scientifically sound? We set these goals for the *BC Journal of Ecosystems and Management* when it was launched in 1999. We aimed to address the needs and interests of a broad readership. And our readers seem to agree that the Journal is making a valuable contribution to the dialogue on sustainable natural resource management in British Columbia.

We recently “checked the pulse” of *JEM* through an on-line survey. We thank the people who took time to answer our questions, and to provide thoughtful suggestions for improving the Journal. What did we learn from this survey? Encouragingly, 83% of the respondents used information from *JEM* in their work or activities. We also found that 55% of those surveyed have passed on *JEM* articles or *JEM* Web links to others. In this age of information overload, your referrals help us to reach people who otherwise might not have time to delve into our pages—thank you!

The survey’s most valuable result, however, came in the form of respondents’ freely offered comments and suggestions for improving *JEM*.

*I believe articles in this journal should be judged on their merit to industry and the applicability of the information to ecosystem management in the industrial context. I would like to see a few articles published challenging the prevailing, or elite, views on ecosystem management (based upon informed argument).*

*JEM* welcomes all articles that are clearly argued and scientifically based. We look forward to truly innovative submissions that will help decision makers in all sectors to question the status quo, or to confirm current directions.

*Avoid industry-prejudiced papers or excessively “green” biased ones, and stick with sound science.*

In common with most science-based journals, the scientific accuracy of all articles is checked through our peer-review process. However, our aim is to present a wide range of perspectives, and reviewers are urged to concentrate on the accuracy of statements and the validity of any interpretations and conclusions. *JEM* seeks to stimulate a cross-sector dialogue in support of more integrated natural resource management. Comments like the following one echo this intention.

*I find that the articles in *JEM* are often informative and interesting. They provide a product that is comprehensible for a broad range of interests.*

And, finally, there are welcome pats on the back.

*Great work! I joined [the listserv] this year and have not been disappointed yet. Kukstemc.*  
[“Thank you” in Secwepemctsin.]

This on-line subscriber is one of many new readers! Over the 2002–03 fiscal year, we recorded 22 568 downloads of *JEM* articles. As a Web-based Journal, we can respond quickly to reader input. You’ll notice our new section, “*JEM* Readers Respond,” on page 78. We plan to include similar responses in future print issues, and can also post your comments on-line in back issues of *JEM*. We hope you’ll embrace *JEM* as a forum for discussion and debate!

We’ll continue to engage our readers in annual evaluations of the Journal. We look forward to confirming or adjusting our course to reflect the needs and preferences of our readership. As *JEM* adapts, you’ll also be adapting—to new conditions, shifting priorities, and emerging knowledge. This is the process *JEM* aims to support.