

Letters

To the Editor:

I would like to point out an error that I discovered in the article "Chemistry Journal Use and Cost: Results of a Longitudinal Study" by Tina E. Chrzastowski and Brian M. Oleisko. On page 107 in the section "Cost of the Top Journals," the authors make the statement that the annual cost of purchasing the top 10 journals rose 159% in eight years, which they assert represents a nearly 20% per year increase in the cost of these journals.

In making this assertion they are ignoring the cumulative effect of yearly cost increases. In fact, the cumulation of annual increases of 20% over an eight-year period would result in a total increase of approximately 330% over the initial cost, not the 159% increase the authors reported. The increase they noted would result from an annual cost increase of about 12.9%. Similarly, the 66.9% increase in the cost of the entire chemistry journal collection does not represent an annual increase of 8.4% as the authors state, but rather an increase of about 6.6% per year.—*Mark Crotteau, Washington State University, Holland Library Bibliographic Control Unit, Pullman, WA 99164-5910; crotteau@wsu.edu*

The author replies:

Mr. Crotteau correctly notes that our application of the data in Table 4 (page 106) does not allow for the cumulation of annual price increases. The data presented in Table 4 are accurate, however, and support our point that journal titles with high local use are more likely to inflate at rates higher than the collection as a whole. We regret the error in computing cumulative percentages and thank Mr. Crotteau for a careful reading of our paper.—*Tina E. Chrzastowski, Chemistry Librarian, University of Illinois; at Urbana-Champaign*

To the Editor:

Allison Carlyle's otherwise very useful article on bibliographic relationships ("Fulfilling the Second Objective in the Online Catalog") in the April 1997 issue of *LRTS* contains a serious error regarding serials cataloging records. Carlyle states that "added entries for an earlier and later title are mandated, thereby partially grouping records under both old and new titles in the catalog . . ." (p. 91). *AACR2* does not mandate such entries, but rather gives such relationships in notes (rule 12.7B7b-c). Rule 21.30J directs the cataloger to make an added entry for any version of the title *that does not constitute a change in the title proper* (italics added).

The USMARC Format for Bibliographic Data includes fields (767-787) known collectively as linking entry fields, where related titles are recorded in catalog-entry form. While some libraries have indexed these fields in their online catalogs, in effect making them catalog entries, the intent of the fields was not to create added entries. The linking entry fields were designed to display a note in the record in which the linking entry appears and to provide machine linkage between the record for the target item and the record for the related item. As Carlyle notes, Melissa Barnhart (Beck) has offered a model for constructing catalog displays utilizing the linking entry fields for serials. Other systems make hypertext links to facilitate navigation among the records. Nonetheless, these fields and strategies are not included, much less mandated, in today's cataloging code.—*Crystal Graham, Digital Information and Serials Cataloging Librarian, University of California, San Diego*

The author replies:

I would first like to thank Crystal Graham