

CHAPTER IV. EFFECTIVE PUBLICATION

SECTION 1. CONDITIONS OF EFFECTIVE PUBLICATION

Article 29

29.1. Publication is effected, under this *Code*, by distribution of printed matter (through sale, exchange, or gift) to the general public or at least to scientific institutions with generally accessible libraries. Publication is also effected by distribution on or after 1 January 2012 of electronic material in Portable Document Format (PDF; see also Art. 29.3 and Rec. 29A.1) in an online publication with an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) or an International Standard Book Number (ISBN).

Ex. 1. The paper containing the new combination *Anaeromyces polycephalus* (Y. C. Chen & al.) Fliegerová & al. (Kirk in *Index Fungorum* 1: 1. 2012), based on *Piromyces polycephalus* Y. C. Chen & al. (2002), was effectively published when it was issued online in Portable Document Format with an ISSN on 1 January 2012.

Note 1. The distribution before 1 January 2012 of electronic material does not constitute effective publication.

Ex. 2. Floristic accounts of the *Asteraceae* in *Flora of China* 20-21, containing numerous nomenclatural novelties, were published online in Portable Document Format on 25 October 2011. Because they were distributed before 1 January 2012 and lacked either an ISBN or an ISSN they were not effectively published. Effective publication occurred when the printed version of the same volume became available on 11 November 2011.

Ex. 3. The paper in which the diatom *Tursiocola podocnemicola* was first described was distributed online on 14 Dec 2011 as an “iFirst” PDF document (DOI: 10.1080/0269249X.2011.642498) available through the *Diatom Research* website (ISSN 0269-249X, print; ISSN 2159-8347, online). Although the paper appeared online in an ISSN-bearing electronic publication in Portable Document Format, it was distributed before 1 January 2012 and was not therefore effectively published. It did not become effectively published on 1 January 2012 merely by remaining available online. Effective publication occurred on 28 Feb 2012, when the printed version of the journal (*Diatom Res.* 27: 2. 2012) was distributed.

29.2. For the purpose of Art. 29.1, “online” is defined as accessible electronically via the World Wide Web.

29.3. Should Portable Document Format (PDF) be succeeded, a successor international standard format communicated by the General Committee (see Div. III) is acceptable.

Recommendation 29A

29A.1. Publication electronically in Portable Document Format (PDF) should comply with the PDF/A archival standard (ISO 19005).

29A.2. Authors of electronic material should give preference to publications that are archived and curated, satisfying the following criteria as far as is practical (see also Rec. 29A.1):

- (a) The material should be placed in multiple trusted online digital repositories, e.g. an ISO-certified repository.
- (b) Digital repositories should be in more than one area of the world and preferably on different continents.
- (c) Deposition of printed copies in libraries in more than one area of the world and preferably on different continents is also advisable (but see Rec. 30A.2).

Article 30

30.1. Publication is not effected by communication of nomenclatural novelties at a public meeting, by the placing of names in collections or gardens open to the public, by the issue of microfilm made from manuscripts or typescripts or other unpublished material, or by distribution of electronic material other than as described in Art. 29.

Ex. 1. Cusson announced his establishment of the genus *Physospermum* in a memoir read at the Société des Sciences de Montpellier in 1770, and later in 1782 or 1783 at the Société de Médecine de Paris, but its effective publication dates from 1787 (in *Hist. Soc. Roy. Méd.* 5(1): 279).

30.2. An electronic publication is not effectively published if there is evidence within or associated with the publication that it is merely a preliminary version that was, or is to be, replaced by a version that the publisher considers final, in which case only that final version is effectively published.

Ex. 2. The name *Rodaucea* was published in a paper first placed online on 12 January 2012 as a PDF document accessible through the website of the journal *Mycologia* (ISSN 0027-5514, print; ISSN 1557-2436, online). That document has a header stating “In Press”, and on the journal website it is qualified as “Preliminary version”, which is clear evidence that it is not considered by the publisher as final. As the final version of the document appeared simultaneously online and in print, a correct citation of the name is: *Rodaucea* W. Rossi & Santam. in *Mycologia* 104 (print & online): 785. 11 Jun 2012.

Ex. 3. The name *Lycopinae* appeared in a paper first placed online on 26 April 2012 as an “Advance Access” PDF document accessible through the website of the *American Journal of Botany* (ISSN 0002-9122, print; ISSN 1537-2197, online). As the journal website stated (May 2012) that “AJB Advance Access articles ... have not yet been printed or posted online by issue” and that “minor corrections may be made before the issue is released” this is evidently not considered the final version by the publisher. *Lycopinae* B. T. Drew & Sytsma was validly published in *Amer. J. Bot.* 99: 945. 1 May 2012, when the paper containing it was effectively published.

Ex. 4. The paper (in *S. African J. Bot.* 80: 63-66; ISSN 0254-6299) in which the name *Nanobubon hypogaeum* J. Magee appears was effectively published online as a PDF document on 30 March 2012 in its “final and fully citable” form, prior to publication of the printed version (May 2012). However, papers appearing online in the same journal under the heading “In Press Corrected Proof” are not effectively published, as the journal website clearly defines that status: “Corrected proofs: articles that contain the authors’ corrections. Final citation details, e.g. volume/issue number, publication year and page numbers, still need to be added and the text might change before final publication.”

Note 1. Citation, for electronic material, of an inappropriate ISSN or ISBN (e.g. one that does not exist or that refers to a serial publication or book in which that electronic material is not included, not even as a declared supplement to an included item) does not effect publication under Art. 29.1.

Ex. 5. The paper by Meyer, Baquero, and Cameron in which “*Dracula trigonopetala*” was described as an intended new species was placed online as a PDF/A document on 1 March 2012. There is no mention of a journal or ISSN in the document itself, but as it was made accessible through the homepage of *OrchideenJournal* (ISSN 1864-9459), it might be argued that it qualifies as an “online publication with an International Standard Serial Number” (Art. 29.1). However, the paper is not presented in a format suited for publication in the *OrchideenJournal* and was evidently not intended for inclusion in that journal. A new version of the paper, translated into German, appeared in print (*OrchideenJ.* 19: 107–112) on 15 August 2012. Although this was effectively published, “*D. trigonopetala*” was not validly published there as no Latin or English description or diagnosis was provided.

30.3. The content of a particular electronic publication must not be altered after it is effectively published. Any such alterations are not themselves effectively published. Corrections or revisions must be issued separately to be effectively published.

Note 2. Content in external sources accessed via a hyperlink or URL (Uniform Resource Locator) embedded in text is not part of the publication; nor is associated information that does not form part of the text itself, such as page numbers (if preliminary or lacking) or watermarks. Content is that which stands alone as the version that the publisher considers final (see Art. 30.2).

Ex. 6. A paper describing the new genus *Partitatheca* and its four constituent species, accepted for the *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* (ISSN 0024-4074, print; ISSN 1095-8339, online), was placed online on 1 February 2012 as an “Early View” PDF document with preliminary pagination (1-29). This was evidently the version considered final by the journal’s publisher because, in the document itself, it was declared the “Version of Record” (an expression defined by the standard, NISO-RP-8-2008). Later, in the otherwise identical electronic version issued upon publication of the printed version on 27 February 2012, the volume pagination (229-257) was added. A correct citation of the generic name is: *Partitatheca* D. Edwards & al. in *Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* 168 (online): [2 of 29], 230. 1 Feb 2012, or better just “... 168 (online): 230. 1 Feb 2012.”

Ex. 7. The new combination *Rhododendron aureodorsale* was made in a paper in *Nordic Journal of Botany* (ISSN 1756-1051, online; ISSN 0107-055X, print), first effectively published online on 13 March 2012 in “Early View”, the “Online Version of Record published before inclusion in an issue”, with a permanent Digital Object Identifier (DOI) but with preliminary pagination (1-EV to 3-EV). Upon publication of the printed version on 20 April 2012, the pagination of the electronic version was changed to 184-186 and the date of the printed version was added. The combination can be cited as *Rhododendron aureodorsale* (W. P. Fang ex J. Q. Fu) Y. P. Ma & J. Nielsen in *Nordic J. Bot.* 30 (online): 184. 13 Mar 2012 (DOI: 10.1111/j.1756-1051.2011.01438.x).

Ex. 8. Two new *Echinops* species, including *E. antalyensis*, were described in *Annales Botanici Fennici* (ISSN 1797-2442, online; ISSN 0003-3847, print) in a paper effectively published in its definitive form on 13 March 2012 as an online PDF document, still with preliminary pagination ([1]-4) and the watermark “preprint”. Upon publication of the printed version on 26 April 2012, the online document was repaginated ([95]-98) and the watermark removed. A correct citation of the name is: *E. antalyensis* C. Vural in *Ann. Bot. Fenn.* 49 (online): 95. 13 Mar 2012.

30.4. Publication by indelible autograph before 1 January 1953 is effective. Indelible autograph produced at a later date is not effectively published.

30.5. For the purpose of Art. 30.4, indelible autograph is handwritten material reproduced by some mechanical or graphic process (such as lithography, offset, or metallic etching).

Ex. 9. Lévillé, *Flore du Kouy Tchéou* (1914-1915), is a work lithographed from a handwritten text.

Ex. 10. *Salvia oxyodon* Webb & Heldr. was effectively published in an indelible autograph catalogue (Webb & Heldreich, *Catalogus plantarum hispanicarum ... ab A. Blanco lectarum*, Paris, Jul 1850, folio).

Ex. 11. The *Journal of the International Conifer Preservation Society*, vol. 5[1]. 1997 (“1998”), consists of duplicated sheets of typewritten text with handwritten additions and corrections in several places. The handwritten portions, being indelible autograph published after 1 January 1953, are not effectively published. Intended new combinations (e.g. “*Abies koreana* var. *yanbaoshanensis*”, p. 53) for which the basionym reference is handwritten are not validly published. The entirely handwritten account of a new taxon (p. 61: name, Latin description, statement of type) is treated as unpublished (see also Rec. 50G).

Ex. 12. The generic designation “*Lindenia*” was handwritten in ink by Bentham in the margin of copies of a published but not yet distributed fascicle of the *Plantae hartwegianae* (1841: 84) to replace the struck-out name *Siphonia* Benth., which he had discovered was a later homonym of *Siphonia* Rich. ex Schreb. (1791). Although the fascicle was then distributed, the handwritten portion was not itself reproduced by mechanical or graphic process and is not therefore effectively published.

30.6. Publication on or after 1 January 1953 in trade catalogues or non-scientific newspapers, and on or after 1 January 1973 in seed-exchange lists, does not constitute effective publication.

30.7. The distribution on or after 1 January 1953 of printed matter accompanying specimens does not constitute effective publication.

Note 3. If the printed matter is also distributed independently of the specimens, it is effectively published.

Ex. 13. The printed labels of Fuckel’s *Fungi rhenani exsiccati* (1863-1874) are effectively published even though not independently issued. The labels antedate Fuckel’s subsequent accounts (e.g. in *Jahrb. Nassauischen Vereins Naturk.* 23-24. 1870).

Ex. 14. Vězda’s *Lichenes selecti exsiccati* (1960-1995) were issued with printed labels that were also distributed as printed fascicles; the latter are effectively published, and nomenclatural novelties appearing in Vězda’s labels are to be cited from the fascicles.

30.8. Publication on or after 1 January 1953 of an independent non-serial work stated to be a thesis submitted to a university or other institute of education for the purpose of obtaining a degree does not constitute effective publication unless the work includes an explicit statement (referring to the requirements of the *Code* for effective publication) or other internal evidence that it is regarded as an effective publication by its author or publisher.

Note 4. The presence of an International Standard Book Number (ISBN) or a statement of the name of the printer, publisher, or distributor in the original printed version is regarded as internal evidence that the work was intended to be effectively published.

Ex. 15. “*Meclatis* in *Clematis*; yellow flowering *Clematis* species – Systematic studies in *Clematis* L. (*Ranunculaceae*), inclusive of cultonomic aspects” a “Proefschrift ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor ... van Wageningen Universiteit” by Brandenburg, was effectively published on 8 June 2000, because it bears the ISBN 90-5808-237-7.

Ex. 16. The thesis “Comparative investigations on the life-histories and reproduction of some species in the siphonous green algal genera *Bryopsis* and *Derbesia*” by Rietema, submitted to Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen in 1975, is stated to have been printed (“Druk”) by Verenigde Reproductie Bedrijven, Groningen and was therefore effectively published.

Ex. 17. The dissertation “Die Gattung *Mycena* s.l.” by Rexer, submitted to the Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen, was effectively published in 1994 because it bears the statement “Druck: Zeeb-Druck, Tübingen 7 (Hagelloch)”, referring to a commercial printer. The generic name *Roridomyces* Rexer and the names of new species in *Mycena*, such as *M. taiwanensis* Rexer, are therefore validly published.

Ex. 18. The thesis by Demoulin, “Le genre *Lycoperdon* en Europe et en Amérique du Nord”, defended in 1971, was not effectively published because it does not contain internal evidence that it is regarded as such. Even if photocopies of it can be found in some libraries, names of new species of *Lycoperdon*, e.g. “*L. americanum*”, “*L. cokeri*”, and “*L. estonicum*”, introduced there, were validly published in the effectively published paper “Espèces nouvelles ou méconnues du genre *Lycoperdon* (Gastéromycètes)” (Demoulin in *Lejeunia*, ser. 2, 62: 1-28. 1972).

Ex. 19. The dissertation by Funk, “The Systematics of *Montanoa* Cerv. (*Asteraceae*)”, submitted to the Ohio State University in 1980, was not effectively published because it does not contain internal evidence that it is regarded as such. The same applies to facsimile copies of the dissertation printed from microfiche and distributed, on demand, from 1980

onward, by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor. The name *Montanoa imbricata* V. A. Funk, introduced in the dissertation, was validly published in the effectively published paper “The systematics of *Montanoa* (*Asteraceae*, *Heliantheae*)” (Funk in Mem. New York Bot. Gard. 36: 1-133. 1982).

Ex. 20. The dissertation “Revision der südafrikanischen Astereengattungen *Mairia* und *Zyrphelis*” submitted in 1990 by Ursula Zinnecker-Wiegand to the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (University of Munich) is not effectively published as it does not include an ISBN, the name of any printer or publisher or distributor, or any statement that it was intended to be effectively published under the *Code*, even though about 50 copies were distributed to other public libraries and all the other formalities for the publication of new taxa were met. The names intended to be published in the thesis were validly published in the effectively published paper by Ortiz & Zinnecker-Wiegand (in Taxon 60: 1194-1198. 2011).

Recommendation 30A

30A.1. Preliminary and final versions of the same electronic publication should be clearly indicated as such when they are first issued.

30A.2. It is strongly recommended that authors avoid publishing nomenclatural novelties in ephemeral printed matter of any kind, in particular printed matter that is multiplied in restricted and uncertain numbers, in which the permanence of the text may be limited, for which effective publication in terms of number of copies is not obvious, or that is unlikely to reach the general public. Authors should also avoid publishing nomenclatural novelties in popular periodicals, in abstracting journals, or on correction slips.

Ex. 1. Kartesz provided an unpaginated printed insert titled “Nomenclatural innovations” to accompany the electronic version (1.0) of the *Synthesis of the North American flora* produced on compact disk (CD-ROM; not effectively published under Art. 30.1). This insert, which is effectively published under Art. 29-31, is the place of valid publication of 41 new combinations, which also appear on the disk, in an item authored by Kartesz: “A synonymized checklist and atlas with biological attributes for the vascular flora of the United States, Canada, and Greenland” (e.g. *Dichantheium hirstii* (Swallen) Kartesz in Kartesz & Meacham, Synth. N. Amer. Fl., Nomencl. Innov.: [1]. Aug 1999). Kartesz’s procedure is not to be recommended, as the insert is unlikely to be permanently stored and catalogued in libraries and so reach the general public.

30A.3. To aid availability through time and place, authors publishing nomenclatural novelties should give preference to periodicals that regularly publish taxonomic articles, or else they should send a copy of a publication (printed or electronic) to an indexing centre appropriate to the taxonomic group. When such publications exist only as printed matter, they should be deposited in at least ten, but preferably more, generally accessible libraries throughout the world.

30A.4. Authors and editors are encouraged to mention nomenclatural novelties in the summary or abstract, or list them in an index in the publication.

SECTION 2. DATES OF EFFECTIVE PUBLICATION

Article 31

31.1. The date of effective publication is the date on which the printed matter or electronic material became available as defined in Art. 29 and 30. In the absence of proof establishing some other date, the one appearing in the printed matter or electronic material must be accepted as correct.

Ex. 1. Individual parts of Willdenow’s *Species plantarum* were published as follows: 1(1), Jun 1797; 1(2), Jul 1798; 2(1), Mar 1799; 2(2), Dec 1799; 3(1), 1800; 3(2), Nov 1802; 3(3), Apr-Dec 1803; 4(1), 1805; 4(2), 1806; these dates are presently accepted as the dates of effective publication (see Stafleu & Cowan in Regnum Veg. 116: 303. 1988).

Ex. 2. Fries first published *Lichenes arctoi* in 1860 as an independently paginated preprint, which antedates the identical content published in a journal (Nova Acta Reg. Soc. Sci. Upsal., ser. 3, 3: 103-398. 1861).

Ex. 3. *Diatom Research* 2(2) bears the date December 1987. However Williams & Round, the authors of a paper in that issue, stated in a subsequent paper (in *Diatom Res.* 3: 265. 1988) that the actual date of publication had been 18 February 1988. Under Art. 31.1 their statement is acceptable as proof establishing another date of publication for issue 2(2) of the journal.

Ex. 4. The paper in which *Ceratocystis omanensis* Al-Subhi & al. is described was available online in final form on *Science Direct* on 7 November 2005, but was not effectively published (Art. 29 Note 1). It was distributed in print (in *Mycol. Res.* 110(2): 237-245) on 7 March 2006, which is the date of effective publication.

31.2. When a publication is issued in parallel as electronic material and printed matter, both must be treated as effectively published on the same date unless the dates of the versions are different as determined by Art. 31.1.

Ex. 5. The paper in which *Solanum baretiae* was validly published was placed online in final form, as a PDF document, on 3 January 2012 in the journal *PhytoKeys* (ISSN 1314-2003). The printed version (ISSN 1314-2011) of the corresponding issue of *PhytoKeys*, with identical pagination and content, is undated but demonstrably later, as it includes a paper dated 6 January 2012. A correct citation of the name is: *S. baretiae* Tepe in *PhytoKeys* 8 (online): 39. 3 Jan 2012.

31.3. When separates from periodicals or other works placed on sale are issued in advance, the date on the separate is accepted as the date of effective publication unless there is evidence that it is erroneous.

Ex. 6. The names of the *Selaginella* species published by Hieronymus (in *Hedwigia* 51: 241-272) were effectively published on 15 October 1911, since the volume in which the paper appeared, though dated 1912, states (p. ii) that the separate appeared on that date.

Recommendation 31A

31A.1. The date on which the publisher or publisher's agent delivers printed matter to one of the usual carriers for distribution to the public should be accepted as its date of effective publication.

Recommendation 31B

31B.1. Authors should indicate precisely the dates of publication of their works. In a work appearing in parts the last-published sheet of the volume should indicate the precise dates on which the different fascicles or parts of the volume were published as well as the number of pages and plates in each.

Recommendation 31C

31C.1. On reprints of papers published in a periodical, the name of the periodical, volume and part number, original pagination, and date (year, month, and day) should be indicated.