

The Production Process

A step-by-step review of the publication process.

The Law Review publishes an annual volume containing four quarterly issues: Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer. The publication process touches the lives of every member of the *Vermont Law Review*, from the earliest solicitation to the final edit. The end result stands as the most visible extension of the school to the general legal community. Therefore, it is critical that every member take his or her responsibilities seriously and maintain the quality of work that warranted the initial invitation to Law Review. In the end, the *Vermont Law Review* is judged by the quality of the publication it produces.

Overview of the Production Process

The following overview represents what we have done historically. The production process changes each year as managing editors tweak and refine the process. Each Managing Editor and Production Coordinator may want to change the steps for an individual manuscript. Questions or recommendations should be directed to the Senior Editorial Board and Managing Editors.

Cite Check

Cite check (CC) is the process of confirming that the authority cited in the manuscript supports the asserted proposition. It is an extremely important component of the production process. Team members gather all cited sources and check the accuracy of the manuscript. If a source has not been provided by the author or is not available either online or in the Cornell Library, team members must let the Production Coordinator know so the Production Coordinator can fill out an inter-library loan (ILL) request form. The Production Coordinator should inform the Managing Editor of any difficulty encountered finding sources as early as possible in the CC round. Team members remain responsible for their assigned sources throughout the entire process.

Photocopies or printouts of the identification pages and cited material must be collected, initialed, and placed in the appropriate production binders by source

number. In addition to assertion checking, the team members must Bluebook the sources and footnotes properly. Quotations also need to be checked for accuracy. Failing to perform in this stage will severely limit the ability of the entire team to successfully edit the manuscript during Line by Line. Team members complete the cite-checking process by preparing a short memo describing any problems they have encountered, and a final and complete list of assigned sources that have not been found. CC will occur in two rounds. The Managing Editor meets with the Production Coordinator when CC is complete to ensure that all missing sources are identified and that the production process and priorities are clearly understood.

Line by Line

Line by Line (LxL) is the detailed process of editing a manuscript, literally, “line by line.” It is in this stage that the major editing takes place for both the text and footnotes. Team members read the text for style, grammar, persuasiveness, composition, spelling, and analysis. Team members also individually check each footnote against the source for accuracy and Bluebook format. Particular care should be taken in the editing process to preserve the author’s voice and individual writing style as much as possible.

LxL editing requires careful attention to detail. This process demands focused efforts to improve the manuscript consistent with priorities identified by the Managing Editor and Production Coordinator. As with every other stage of the production process, team members turn in a short cover memo when the assignment is complete. Team members proofread, check ILL sources, double-check footnotes for proper Bluebook format, and double-check all sources for accuracy, including quotations and those previously checked by other team members. This process is necessarily repetitive. Repetition and review of the work of others is the only way to catch errors and ensure a quality product. Like CC, LxL will occur in two rounds.

Author Edits

After the LxL round, the Production Coordinator decides to accept or reject the recommended team edits and modifies the electronic manuscript accordingly. The Production Coordinator reviews the entire piece for accuracy and consistency and then hands control of the piece to the Managing Editor. After the Managing Editor returns the manuscript, the Production Coordinator reviews the changes, makes necessary modifications, and sends the manuscript back to the author for review and comment.

Proofing

Proofing is the final stage of production. If errors are not caught in this stage, they usually make it in to the published version. Although only minor edits to text, footnotes, and formatting details should be necessary, it is **critical** that all errors are located and corrected during the proof round.

Final Production

Once the final team edits have been included, the Production Coordinator reviews and edits the piece one final time before giving the manuscript to the Managing Editor. The Managing Editor performs a detailed review of the entire piece and prepares the manuscript and computer file for final publication. Once the Managing Editor is satisfied that the piece is complete, he or she hands control of the piece to the Editor-in-Chief (EIC) and Senior Managing Editor (SME).

The EIC prepares the issue for publication. The EIC shares the review and editing responsibilities for each manuscript with the SME. This entails preparing the book cover, table of contents, advertising sections, special editorial comments, and layout of the manuscripts. The EIC then prints the entire issue and edits it. Once satisfied with its completeness, the EIC submits the camera-ready pages to the printer. If any author has requested a proof copy, a manuscript is sent to the author for review. The publisher converts the issue to page proofs and sends a final copy back to the EIC. The EIC reviews the page proofs and makes any necessary edits, incorporating any recommendations the authors may have suggested. The EIC finally releases the issue for printing and the publisher prints and distributes the issues to our distribution list.

The Production Schedule

Shown below are the typical timeframes attached to the various production tasks:

Production Phase	Est'd Time Frame
Preproduction ME and PC	7–10 days
Cite Checking	
Team Cite Check	11–13 days
PC Edit and Review	6 days
ME Review	6 days
Line by Line	
Teams	12–14 days
PC Edit and Review	5–6 days
ME Review	6 days
Author Edit	1 week

Proof Round	
Teams	8 days
PC Review and Final Edit	5 days
ME Final Edit	5 days
SEB Final Edit	5 days
BOOK TO PRINTER	

The Players in the Production Process

This section describes the duties and responsibilities of managers and staff in the production process.

What the Senior Managing Editor Does

The SME is responsible for gathering together the manuscripts for each issue. The SME assigns a Managing Editor (ME) and Production Coordinator (PC) to each manuscript. Shortly thereafter, the SME assigns a team of staff members to each manuscript. Each manuscript is different and a team member's experience will vary from issue to issue. A staff member usually stays with one team throughout each issue, but may be shifted as necessity dictates.

The first thing the SME does to the article is to convert the electronic version of the article into Galley format using the Vermont Styles template. This may involve a pre-conversion step from WordPerfect into Word. To prevent the loss of formatting changes, no edits should be made until after the manuscript has been put into Galley format. To prevent errors and duplication of editing efforts, the PC and ME must follow the file-naming conventions established by the SME. To prevent data loss, the PC and ME should back up current versions of the manuscript onto external media. The SME backs up the entire issue's folder from the network, but team members should rely on the network K: drive to save current work. Any lost or corrupted information will have to be redone, so save often and early, and make sure you follow the file-naming conventions.

To ensure that the production process stays on schedule, the CC round for the next article will be assigned while the current article is with the author for the author's review. After the overlapped CC round and the author edits are complete, the team begins work on Proof Round for the earlier article.

Additionally, the SME works with the EIC to perform the final edit and proof on the finished piece before releasing it for publication.

What the Managing Editors Do

An ME's first task is to read the manuscript and provide substantive comments regarding any major editing issues the article presents, including the organization of the piece, the logic of the arguments, and whether any major redrafting is likely to be necessary. The ME documents this analysis in a preliminary cover memorandum to the PC assigned to the article. The memo becomes part of the production binder.

The ME meets with the PC to discuss the duties and responsibilities of each member of the team, and to ensure that the Production Coordinator understands all aspects of the job. At this time, work on the actual manuscript is ready to begin.

During the production process, the ME reviews the PCs' edits, accepting changes to the footnotes only. The ME will review the textual recommendations, but accepting those changes is the privilege of the author. After every stage of the process, the ME writes a memo to the PC explaining the changes that the ME made to the manuscript. Additionally, the ME needs to alert the PC to any problems the team needs to focus on in the next round.

What the Production Coordinators Do

The PC is the main shepherd of an individual manuscript and operates with primary responsibility over its content and edits. The Editorial Board member production credit is directly attributed to the PC duties and carries with it the appropriate burden for excellence.

Read the Article

Once the PC receives the manuscript, it is imperative that he or she read and understand it. The PC is the primary editor of the manuscript and is ultimately responsible for achieving a publishable version.

Create the Source List

The next task for the PC is to create a source list for the manuscript. The source list contains every source cited in the manuscript, organized into groups including cases, books, articles, legislative and other materials, government documents, and electronic resources. Within each category, the sources are in alphabetical order by author's last name and each source is assigned a source number. Each source on the list should also show every footnote in the manuscript in which the source appears. (*See* Figure 1). The PC is responsible for updating the source list as necessary throughout the production process.

For student-written Notes and the Chase Paper competition, the author is responsible for this step and for providing an electronic version of the source list

in Microsoft Word format. The PC is responsible for ensuring that all sources used in the Note are included in the source list and making any other changes necessary to the source list.

	SOURCE	FOOTNOTES	TEAM MEMBER	Source Location
	CASES			
	Bowers v. Hardwick, 478 U.S. 186 (1986).	58	Amy	
	LAW REVIEWS			
	Austin, Arthur D., <i>The Waste Land of Law School Fiction</i> , 1986 DUKE L. J. 495	45, 46	Joe	
	Grant, Judith, <i>Lawyers As Superheroes: "The Firm," "The Client," and "The Pelican Brief,"</i> 30 UNIV. SAN FRAN. L. REV. 1111 (1996).	59	Heather	
	Menkel-Meadow, Carrie, <i>The Sense and Sensibilities of Lawyers: Lawyering in Literature, Narratives, Film and Television, and Ethical Choices Regarding Career and Craft</i> , 31 MCGEORGE L. REV. 1 (1999).	63	Jody	
	Papke, David Ray <i>Mr. District Attorney: The Prosecutor During the Golden Age of Radio</i> , 34 UNIV. TOLEDO L. REV. 781 (2003)	28	Amy	
	Shale, Suzanne, <i>The Conflicts of Law and the Character of Men: Writing "Reversal of Fortune" and "Judgment at Nuremberg,"</i> 30 U.S.F. L. REV. 991 (1996)	15, 33, 38	Heather	
	Williams, Robert F., <i>The Claus von Bulow Case: Chutzpah and State Constitutional Law?</i> , 26 CONN. L. REV. 711 (1994).	37	Joe	
	BOOKS & ENCYCLOPEDIAS			
	ABRAMS, M. H., A GLOSSARY OF LITERARY TERMS (7th ed., 1999)	14, 16	JODY	ILL
	BALL, MILNER, THE WORD AND THE LAW (1993).	62	AMY	VLS
	BERGMAN, ANDREW, WE'RE IN THE MONEY: DEPRESSION AMERICA AND ITS FILMS (1971).	21	JOE	ILL
	BLEDSTEIN, BURTON J., THE CULTURE OF PROFESSIONALISM (1978)	4	HEATHER	ILL

Figure 1: A section of a source list

Set Up the Binders

The production process requires two binders to begin with. The first binder is the "Production Binder" and it includes:

- A master copy of the source list.

- A master copy of the latest version of the manuscript. Label the master copy “Master Copy” and give it a current file name using the correct naming protocol.
- The original version of the manuscript.
- All subsequent production memos and edited versions of the manuscript.

A complete record is critical because it allows the ME and Senior Editorial Board to know the status of the manuscript at any given time. All materials in the Production Binder must be labeled and dated to prevent confusion.

The second binder, or often set of binders, is the “Source Binder” and is for the photocopied sources that are collected by the teams during the CC round. For competition papers, the authors will have already compiled the binders. Some authors may provide sources, which should be made available to the team.

After putting the appropriate materials in the binders, the PC should place them on the shelves on the second floor of the Law Review Office.

Assign Production Tasks to the Team

Once the PC has reviewed the manuscript and completed these preliminary steps, he or she produces a first assignment production memo to distribute to team members along with the source list and a copy of the manuscript in Galley format. The production memo incorporates the ME’s comments from the preliminary production memo as well as any special instructions for the team. The PC should:

- Divide the source list into equal shares among team members. Assignments and division should be logical; e.g., sources with multiple footnotes should not be split up between team members and, where possible, footnotes containing multiple sources should be assigned to one team member.
- Organize the citation lists so that all assertions derived from a single source are assigned to an individual team member. This ensures that only one team member will need that source for cite checking and enables that team member to best judge what portion of the source requires copying.
- Submit the source list and drafted team memo with assignments to the ME for review and approval.
- Distribute the memo and materials to the 2L team once the ME approves the source list and memo.

Identify Problem Sources/Candidates for ILL

During this process, the PC also identifies those sources that could be problematic for the team to find and works with the ME to strategize alternative ways for the team to find the sources.

- Begin a preliminary list of sources that may need to be obtained via ILL or from the author and submit the list to the ME.
- Be prepared to give guidance to the team when approached with questions about finding sources.
- Contact your ME if you are unsure of how to answer a particular source-finding question.

Contact the Author

Once the manuscript has been reviewed, the PC contacts the author to introduce the team members and describe the production process. If the PC believes that substantial edits may be necessary, the PC should discuss the scope of necessary revisions with the author to avoid misunderstandings later in the process. The PC confirms this discussion in a letter to the author.

Step-by-Step Instructions

Shown below are the step-by-step instructions to follow to accomplish the various production tasks.

Cite Checking

The CC process confirms that the authority cited in the manuscript supports the proposition asserted. This is the foundation of the entire production process. CC can be time-consuming, so it is essential that team members allow plenty of time to accomplish this task. Do not wait until the last minute. If cite checking is not done correctly, it will affect the entire production schedule and will inevitably result in confusion at later stages.

It is absolutely necessary that team members exercise due diligence and patience in this phase, making every effort to locate the sources. If a team member cannot find a source that has been assigned, he or she should notify the PC as soon as possible so the PC can obtain the source via ILL.

When requesting help, you should explain what steps you took to locate the source. Make sure you have made a thorough investigation before approaching your PC for an ILL.

To minimize disorganization and hardship later in the production process, it is imperative that everyone follows all the steps of the CC process. Oversights will haunt you later in the production process. It can be very frustrating to be in the middle of LxL and have to run to the library to photocopy a source that you or someone else has overlooked.

FOR ALL
SOURCE
BINDER
MATERIALS:

- Remove all staples.
 - Copy all source materials double-sided.
 - Keep materials neat so that page edges do not rip or curl.
 - This will make scanning the source binders much easier.
-

1. Locate the Authority

Ask the PC if the author has provided any sources and start there. If the sources are not provided, use the following protocol for locating authority. Remember, the resource librarians can help you find sources and navigate you to parts of the library you may not have visited in your first year.

Cases

You must photocopy from case reporters for a number of reasons. First, some Westlaw and Lexis printouts may not properly show block quotes, italics, or other important format information. Second, it is easier to copy only the pages cited and ensure correct pin cites when using the reporters. A photocopy from the case reporter is required for any quoted material to ensure accuracy. Third, you need to include photocopies of the cover and title page of the reporter and the first page of the case.

As per *The Bluebook*, each case cited must include any relevant subsequent history. Be sure to Shepardize the case and provide a printout with the source. Shepard's is available in book form or on Lexis. On Westlaw, this feature is known as KeyCite. If there is any direct negative history, confirm whether the assertion has been overruled or significantly modified by a later decision. Failure to Shepardize will result in having to locate subsequent history later in the production process. Get it while you are there the first time.

Statutes

Library shelf resources tend to be more reliable and accessible for statutory research. Begin your research there. *Do not forget to check the pocket part.* Copy the relevant section(s) of the statute as well as the title page of the book bearing the publication date. The date for the statutes is usually on the spine of the book. If Cornell Library does not have a particular source, then move to Westlaw and Lexis to acquire the authority.

Books

Try to locate all books in the Cornell Library. If a book is unavailable and the source is only cited as a *see generally*, let the PC and ME know that the book cannot be obtained. See if you can obtain relevant Bluebook information from an Internet site, such as amazon.com or barnesandnoble.com. The PC and ME will decide if this information is sufficient. If the assertion requires a pincite or uses a *see*, it will be necessary to obtain the source via ILL or other means.

Law Reviews and Journals

Locating an exact quote or assertion is easier in the shelf version of law reviews and journals. Photocopy the title page of the journal, the first page of the article, and the relevant body pages. The basement of the Cornell Library and HeinOnline have many of the leading reviews and journals— you should start your search there. Westlaw and Lexis should only be a last resort. A number of non-legal arts and sciences scholarly journals can be found on jstor.org, which hosts scanned versions of the original publications.

Newspapers and
Magazines

If Cornell Library has the source, use it. If not, use Westlaw or Lexis. If neither of those databases has the source, search the Internet. When printing articles, make every effort to print the exact page numbers of the newspaper. *The Bluebook* requires page identification when possible and has specific rules for commercial databases and Internet sources. Read these rules carefully. For local newspapers, it may be necessary to use the Dartmouth Library or the state library in Montpelier.

Government
Documents,
Treatises, and
Miscellaneous
Resources

Find these where you can, either in Cornell Library or online. The library contains many of these sources, although some may be difficult to locate. Be sure to ask a reference librarian before requesting the source through an ILL. If possible, locate online resources in PDF format, as these are usually direct scans of the original document and can be treated as such for Bluebook purposes. The Thomas Legislative Collection at www.loc.gov and the Government Printing Office at www.gpo.gov are great sites for federal legislative and regulatory information, respectively.

Many scholarly articles include research involving unpublished, archived sources that cannot be obtained through any reasonable means, including an ILL. Copies of these sources must be requested from the author as early as possible in the production process.

2. Confirm the Author's Assertions

Confirm that the author's assertions are supported by the cited sources. This step requires great attention to detail. You must check every word in quoted material for misquotes, spelling errors, and missing or added words. Mark your corrections directly on the manuscript.

- If the assertion is to a direct quote, confirm the accuracy of the quotation.
- If a cited source does not support an assertion, check other portions of the source for the assertion.
- If you cannot locate the assertion, include this information in your cover memo, and bring it up for discussion at the team meeting after the CC round. The PC or ME will confirm whether the source supports the assertion. If not, the PC will contact the author for assistance in either clarifying or revising the reference in the manuscript.

There are occasions where a cited source will require a parenthetical explanation. Bluebook rules require the use of a parenthetical explanation whenever the relevance of the authority cited might not be clear to the reader. Refer to *The Bluebook* for more detailed guidance on the proper format of the parenthetical explanation. If the author did not provide the required parenthetical explanation, the team member should draft one. Remember to be deferential, but not blind, to an author's prerogative to make inferences. For more information, see *How to Write Parentheticals* in Chapter 4.

3. Photocopy the Supporting Sources

Photocopy or print all relevant pages, including the “identification” pages and all other pages specifically cited within the source. Identification pages are those containing the information necessary for proper citation, such as title pages and caption pages.

Use your best judgment when photocopying or printing. The ultimate goal is to copy enough material to enable proper citation and assertion confirmation. Anyone looking at the binder—your team members in later rounds, the PC, the ME, and the Senior Editorial Board—should be able to see the support for the assertion and verify all information in the footnote without having to go to the original source. If the source is very lengthy, such as a 75-page law review article, review all of the assertions before copying.

- If there is only one direct quote, then copy only the identification pages and the page containing the quote.
- If there are several quotes and all are located within the same subpart, then copy the identification pages and subpart.
- If the assertion is not a direct quote but a *see* or *see generally*, copy all pages containing enough information to show where the author may have reached his or her conclusion.

This manual cannot fully address all the variables in the CC process. If you are uncertain, contact your PC or ME for assistance.

4. Highlight the Assertion

Highlight the passage that supports the author’s assertion, underline any direct quotations in red pen, and write the footnote number and your initials in the margin of the photocopy or printout for identification purposes.

5. Bluebook the Source and Apply the Vermont Conventions

Bluebook the source in *every* footnote in which it appears. Be sure to follow *The Bluebook* and Vermont Conventions for the correct form for later short cites.

You must verify the spelling of the author’s name, the title of the publication, the date of publication, and any other information contained in the footnote.

Write the corrected information directly on the manuscript copy to be turned in to the PC. If you have looked up a rule in *The Bluebook*, write the rule number in the margin of the manuscript to assist the PC who will review the edits.

6. File the Source in Binder

File the information in the appropriate binder. The material should be three-hole punched, numbered in the upper right hand corner with the appropriate source list number, initialed by the team member, and placed in the binder by source number.

7. Write a Cover Memo

Team members are usually the only Law Review members who will actually read the original sources cited by the author, so substantive input from the assigned team members is extremely important to the final product.

- Correct simple errors involving grammar, spelling, misquotes, and Bluebooking directly on the manuscript copy.
- Suggest parenthetical explanations directly on the manuscript.
- Organize your cover memo so that footnotes are in numerical order.

Write a short cover memo to the PC so that ME, the SME, and the EIC can easily identify the most important issues for later editing rounds. The cover memo is a necessary part of each step of the production process, and should document any difficulties encountered and general comments on the manuscript. In the unlikely event that the manuscript is perfect, the cover memo should say so. Include substantive concerns about the manuscript's organization or conclusions. Identify the sources that are still waiting for an ILL.

8. Participate in the Team Meeting

After the CC round is substantially complete, the ME, the PC, and the assigned staff members may meet to discuss the missing sources and other issues identified by the team members. Failure to discuss the project at an early stage leads to confusion and miscommunication. Because most Law Review members have busy schedules, arranging this meeting in a timely manner may require substantial effort and cooperation from all team members. The PC should schedule this meeting well in advance. Additional meetings will be held when necessary at the discretion of the PC and ME.

What to Do When You Cannot Find the Source: Inter-library Loans

When a source cannot be located either in the library or online, it may be necessary to request the source through an ILL. These requests should be avoided unless absolutely necessary because they are expensive and time-consuming.

1. Notify the PC that the Source Is Missing

If you cannot locate a source, ask your PC for help early during the CC round. Contact the PC as soon as possible so that he or she can decide which sources will need to be obtained through ILL.

2. The PC Contacts the Library and Procures the Source

The PC contacts the library to request missing sources through ILL. When sources arrive through ILL, the PC notifies the requesting team member that the source is in and places the ILL source in the team member's mailbox.

ALL ILLS ARE
DONE BY THE
PRODUCTION
COORDINATOR

3. Cite Check the Source

This cite check should be done in a separate memo to the PC, noting every footnote that the source is in. Adhere to the CC rules and make any necessary corrections. It is extremely important to make all corrections once the source arrives because ILL's arrive at various times and the PC and ME need to be sure that all ILL materials are incorporated into the manuscript.

4. Copy the Source

Copy each ILL source as you would any other source and place the copy in the binder.

5. Return the Source to the PC

Return the borrowed source to the PC's mailbox as soon as possible with a note indicating that the source has been checked and copied. The PC amends the master missing source list and affirms that the team member has completed cite-checking the source.

About Going to Dartmouth Library

Many sources that we do not have in our library can be found at Dartmouth. Because the ILL process can sometimes take significant time and delay production, the PC may require team members to travel to Dartmouth to check sources if a sufficient number of sources can easily be found there.

What Happens After Cite-Check

After the CC round, the PC reviews the manuscript copies, proposes edits, and inputs corrections into the computer file.

- Simple Bluebook and formatting corrections do not need to be indicated using the Track Changes function in Microsoft Word. However, all substantive changes (e.g., any changes in sentence structure, word changes, spelling changes, etc.) in text and footnotes, as well as the recommendation of new footnotes, deleted footnotes, and parenthetical explanations should be made using the Track Changes function. MEs may request that all changes be done with the Track Changes function, but that choice is within each ME's discretion. Each ME should tell their PCs their preference.
- The PC updates the master source list in the production binder to reflect new sources and Bluebook edits. Team members should be able to match the source listed in the manuscript with the source on the list in later rounds. PCs should let their team members know when they have completed updating the master source list.
- The PC is responsible for referring to the source binder during this round to ensure that team members are following CC protocol and have adequately verified the sources. It is essential to make notes of any deficiencies in the source material in the binder because team members

must make the appropriate corrections during the next production round. Additionally, if team members misuse or misinterpret Bluebook rules, PCs should note this in the team memo. Keep in mind that all comments should be constructive. The team members are new to the process and will need ongoing training to ensure that they understand the rules.

- The PC then prints out a new master copy of the manuscript and places it in the production binder.
- The PC then drafts, and submits to the ME for review, a memo to the team with feedback on the CC round, including assignments and instructions for the LxL round. The memo must indicate any work that remains to be completed on individual sources from the CC round.
- Once PCs are satisfied with their changes to the manuscript, they pass it on to the ME. The ME then reviews all the changes, accepting simple, non-substantive Bluebooking changes while leaving substantive changes (such as new parentheticals) for author review. The ME should also spot check assertions and quotations. The ME writes a memo to the PC noting any recurrent errors they found or other issues the team needs to keep in mind for LxL.
- Upon approval by the ME, the PC distributes the assignments and memo to the team to begin LxL.

The Line-by-Line Edit

The LxL round is the process of editing the manuscript, literally line by line, in teams of two. Most major changes to the text of the manuscript occur at this stage. In addition, although footnotes have been examined by cite-checkers, the LxL pair reviews each footnote again for proper Bluebooking using the source in the binder. The team members note any deficiencies in the source materials that have not already been identified by the PC, and report this information to the PC and the ME so they can instruct the appropriate team member to provide the required information.

LXL OVERVIEW:

1. READ THE MANUSCRIPT OUT LOUD.
 2. IDENTIFY PROBLEMS.
 3. AGREE ON CHANGES.
 4. MARK THE MANUSCRIPT.
-

1. Read the Article Out Loud

Meet with your teammate and read the manuscript out loud to each other, agreeing upon all changes to be made and marking corrections in red pen on one copy of the manuscript. You must correct all mistakes, including mistakes of analysis, grammar, composition, style, presentation, passive voice, spelling, and format in this round. Use standard proofreader's marks in this and every stage of the production process so that the PC and ME understand the comments. After the LxL, the piece should be in shape to send to the author to approve the changes.

2. Check the Footnotes

Check every footnote for proper Bluebook form. Even if *The Bluebook* rule is obvious, write the rule in the margin next to each change. Also check every footnote against the Vermont Conventions and write the rule in the margin next to each change.

3. Turn in the Corrected Manuscript

Turn in one corrected copy of the manuscript, along with a cover memo, to the PC. At a minimum, the cover memo should identify any sources that are still missing and state whether any substantive or organizational problems are still present in the manuscript.

4. Retain the Author's Voice

It is important to retain the author's voice in this round. *Vermont Law Review* is very deferential to the author's voice. Articles, as distinguished from less-formal works published in the Law Review, should be edited with the least degree of deference, both in language and content. An essay should receive much greater deference than articles, both in language and content. A lecture or speech reproduction should remain as true to the original manuscript as possible. Student notes are treated as articles and receive substantial, critical analysis. Finally, it is important to consider who the author is. A legal scholar is often engaged in the practice of suggesting changes to the law and should be given much greater leeway for assertions than most practitioners or student authors. The ME should provide guidance to the PC and team for each individual manuscript, but if any team member is unsure of the extent of changes to be made, he or she should consult with the ME.

5. Tips for Getting Through the Line by Line

The LxL process can be very time-consuming, so do not spend hours arguing with your partner over minor points of grammar, style, or punctuation. Suggest a reasonable correction and move on. It is often wise to LxL over several sessions as eyes quickly become tired and mistakes invariably occur. If questions arise, avoid writing messages and questions on the manuscript. Instead, contact the PC if you can and mention important issues and questions in the cover memo. Make note of unsupported assertions.

6. Grammar and Style Issues

Many questions of grammar and style are likely to arise during the LxL phase. The Vermont Conventions have recommendations for some confusing situations, but you should use them only when *The Bluebook* is ambiguous or unclear about a situation. *Vermont Law Review* prefers the use of *The Redbook* as a style guide. Other sources for grammar and style include the *Manual on Style* (Texas Law Review ed., 9th ed. 2002) and Strunk and White's *Elements of Style* (4th ed. 2000). These sources are located on the second floor of the Law Review office. If a special rule is applied, please indicate the rule and source of the rule in the margin for the benefit of the PC.

LXL TIPS:

1. DON'T ARGUE.

2. HOLD
MULTIPLE
SESSIONS.

3. PUT
QUESTIONS IN
THE COVER
MEMO.

4. CONSULT THE
VERMONT
CONVENTIONS.

What Happens after Line-by-Line

After the LxL, the PC incorporates the team edits into the electronic manuscript, again using the Track Changes function. The PC has the discretion to accept or reject the team's comments and edits.

- The PC also incorporates the ILL edits from the master manuscript in the production binder.
- If the PC is unsure of a particular edit, the conflict should be resolved immediately by asking the ME instead of embedding comments in the manuscript itself.
- The PC may use comments to the team embedded in the text if certain footnotes need work, but the PC also has the authority to send the LxL back to the teams if the work is inadequate.
- The PC must review the entire document at this stage to catch any overlooked errors and ensure that all the changes make sense.
- The PC then forwards a complete copy of the manuscript to the ME.
- If a team member receives an ILL during this phase, he or she should contact the ME to incorporate any changes before the piece is sent to the author.

The Author Edit

The PC reviews the manuscript to become familiar with the recommended edits, performs a Bluebook edit, and sends the manuscript to the author for the author edit. The PC should make every effort to discuss substantial changes with the author prior to sending out the corrected manuscript to ensure that the author is not taken by surprise. The original contract with the author specifies the time for author review. Ordinarily, the author should not have the manuscript for more than five days. Upon return of the manuscript, the ME incorporates the author's recommendations. This is often a very difficult process as legal scholars are not always receptive to student edits.

Once the author has finished reviewing the changes, the ME finalizes the manuscript. By this point, the author will have accepted all the changes that he desires and left unaccepted all the changes that he or she rejects. The ME removes the Track Changes corrections to produce a clean, edited copy of the manuscript. The ME then returns the manuscript to the PC for the proof round.

Proof Round

Once the PC receives the manuscript, he or she prepares the next round of assignments. Team members perform their work during the proofing round individually, according to assignments given by the PC. Proofing is the final stage

of production. This is the stage where all errors, no matter how insignificant, must be identified and corrected. Proofing is not the time to restructure a manuscript or make major changes.

1. The PC Puts a Master Copy in the Production Binder

The PC places a master copy of the manuscript in the production binder for any remaining ILL cite checking.

2. The Team Members Look for Errors

Team members should read the manuscript out loud, looking for all errors and paying particular attention to the formatting conventions. It is helpful to look at the Vermont Conventions or a past issue of the *Vermont Law Review* to see what the proper format looks like. Mark all errors and omissions in red pen. Pay particular attention to spacing, as the removal of the Track Changes corrections often creates spacing problems. This will be difficult because the piece will be fully justified, so mark only those spaces that seem significantly out of proportion. Teams should check *supras* and *infras* and ensure that each footnote references the correct location.

3. Team Members Submit the Corrected Copy

Each team member should submit one corrected copy of the assigned manuscript section. A cover memo is necessary only if missing sources or substantial textual issues remain. You may notice that some past edits and recommendations were not incorporated into the manuscript. This is a result of a conscious decision by the PC, ME, or author. Nevertheless, mark problems that you see as some errors invariably make it through.

4. Make Sure You Have Dealt with All Inter-Library Loans

Any remaining ILLs coming into the Law Review office should be incorporated into the master manuscript in the production binder as soon as possible.

What the Production Coordinator Does Post-Proofing Round

Once again, the PC has the discretion to accept or reject changes suggested in the team's corrected copies or the master manuscript copy. The PC, after entering all team changes from the proofing round and any source edits on the master copy from ILLs, prints out a copy of the manuscript and proofreads the entire manuscript, entering any changes the team may have missed.

Any *supras* or *infras* should be checked one last time to ensure that they are correct. Once satisfied that the piece is in excellent shape, the PC hands off the piece to the ME. The PC must outline in a detailed memo to the ME any remaining concerns about the article, including substantive concerns or assertions that have not been verified due to missing sources.

Managing Editor Final Edit

The ME reviews and edits the final manuscript one more time. The ME makes any further edits deemed necessary and removes any remaining Track Changes corrections. Once the ME is satisfied with the final version, the ME notifies the EIC and officially hands control of the manuscript to the SME and EIC.

Final Production

The EIC is responsible for the final production of the issue prior to publication.

1. Put the Issue Together

The EIC gathers the manuscripts and compiles the issue. This includes updating the book cover, the table of contents, and any advertising or related content. The EIC drafts any necessary notes from the editors or special tributes.

2. Make Final Edits to the Articles

Once the book is compiled, the EIC and the SME make any final edits to the articles.

3. Send the Articles to the Authors for a Final Review

Once a final manuscript is ready, each article should be sent to the author for a final review. Because Track Changes corrections have been removed, the EIC should point out in a memo any major changes that have been made since the author edit. The author should complete the review within forty-eight hours and return the manuscript by overnight mail, courier, or email.

4. Perform Final Edits/Print the Camera-ready Version

The EIC and SME now edit the entire book until they are satisfied with the final product, and then print the entire issue in camera-ready form.

5. Send the Book to the Publisher

Once the final book is deemed complete, the EIC sends the camera-ready book to the publisher. The EIC may also send individual manuscripts to the author if requested. The publisher converts the camera-ready prints into “blue lines.” These are copies of what the book will look like when published.

6. Review the Proofs from the Publisher

The publisher then sends the blue lines to the EIC, who reviews them one last time with the SME. The EIC can submit minor changes to the publisher in camera-ready print, but the contract with the printer usually allows only a small number of changes at this stage. If more changes are necessary, there will be a substantial increase in the printing cost.

7. Authorize the Publisher to Print the Issue

When the book is deemed complete, the EIC authorizes the publisher to run the issue. The publisher produces the issue and mails individual copies to our subscription list, which has been continuously updated by the Business Manager throughout the semester. Extra copies and author reprints are mailed to the *Vermont Law Review*, where the Business Manager and the EIC mail them or distribute them as necessary.

Maintaining the Cumulative Index

Throughout the year, the EIC and Articles Editor should maintain a cumulative index of published articles. An annual index should appear at the end of each summer issue. The *Vermont Law Review* bylaws require this index to be maintained but, occasionally, the index has not appeared. The last cumulative index appeared as part of the summer issue in Volume 25.