

Forum

Readers are invited to offer thesis and dissertation abstracts, review articles, scientific/technological notes, book reviews, comments on previously published papers and discussions of relevant scientific/technological interest, for publication in the **Forum** of *Cave and Karst Science*.

All views expressed are those of the individual authors and do not represent the views of the Association unless this is expressly stated. Contributions to the *Cave and Karst Science Forum* are not subject to the normal refereeing process, but the editors reserve the right to revise or shorten text. Such changes will only be shown to the authors if they affect scientific content. Opinions expressed by authors are their responsibility and will not normally be edited, though remarks considered derogatory or libellous will be removed, at the editors' discretion.



BCRA Cave Science Symposium and Field Meeting 2026

Symposium: Saturday 17 October 2026:

School of Science, Engineering and Environment, Peel Park Campus, University of Salford, M5 4WX.

Field Meeting: Sunday 18 October, 2026:

Manifold Valley, SW Peak District.

First circular and call for abstracts

The British Cave Research Association are pleased to announce details of the 37th Annual Cave Science Symposium and associated Field Meeting. The Symposium will be hosted by Dr Bethany Fox at the School of Science, Engineering and Environment, University of Salford, on Saturday 17 October, 2026. A programme of presentations is being assembled that will be of interest to anyone wishing to know more about the underground environment. Further details will be available on the BCRA website [<https://bcra.org.uk/sym/>], as well as via other on-line news outlets.

Symposium

This year's Symposium will include oral and poster presentations covering BCRA's principal areas of interest.

Traditionally a live event, it is hoped that this year's Symposium will also be streamed on Zoom. Information shown on the BCRA website will be updated when necessary, with final details confirmed a few weeks before the event.

BCRA's AGM will take place during the Science Symposium "Lunch Break" (approximately between 12:00 and 12:50). Details will be posted online [bcra.org.uk/agm] a few weeks before the event.

For those interested, an informal evening meal to follow the Symposium is being arranged in Manchester City Centre, (booking required: please check the Symposium section of the BCRA website for details).

The Symposium Lecture Secretary is Bethany Fox [b.r.s.fox@salford.ac.uk].

Call for abstracts

Submissions of abstracts for potential posters or oral presentations are welcomed on topics related to cave- or karst-based research. These should be submitted by email no later than 26 August, 2026, to symposium@bcra.org.uk. Please include names of all authors (with affiliations), an email address for the primary author, and an abstract of up to 500 words (main text and References only).

Registration

Please fill in the registration form available via the BCRA website, especially if you are planning to submit an abstract or attend the post-Symposium dinner and/or the Sunday Field Meeting. Registration is also available on-site on the day. A small donation is requested to help cover the cost of refreshments.

Venue

The Symposium will be held in room 0.11 of the Science, Engineering and Environment (SEE) building on the Peel Park Campus, University of Salford. M5 4WX

Field Meeting

A field trip led by Andy Farrant and John Gunn will take place to the Manifold Valley, SW Peak District, on Sunday 18 October. Further details will be available closer to the event [<https://bcra.org.uk/sym/>].

Symposium organisers

Please contact Dr Bethany Fox [b.r.s.fox@salford.ac.uk] for details of the venue and local facilities in Salford and Manchester, as well as for details of the programme and for guidance concerning oral or poster presentations.

For information regarding the Field Meeting, please contact John Gunn [j.gunn.1@bham.ac.uk]

All are welcome, and we look forward to seeing you at the Symposium.



Notes for Authors



Making Academic Writing a Habit

Stephen K DONOVAN

Swinton, Greater Manchester, UK

E-mail: SKennethDono@gmail.com

Abstract: Writing is hard work for many academic scientists, but it can be transformed into a more palatable task with a little thought, practice and planning. Writing should form a central component of your research effort; do not divorce it from your core activities. I suggest five behaviours that may make writing more endurable: write regularly, if only a paragraph a day; vary what you write, such as research papers, books reviews and conference abstracts; have an annual target for your productivity; work with productive co-authors; and discover the more efficient journals in which to publish. Writing and publishing ensures that your observations and ideas will contribute to your area of expertise in the future.

I am writing this article on a whim and I hope I can maintain an idiosyncratic air throughout; you are my judge. I retired over five years ago and I have retained my enthusiasm for the geological sciences. In my proto-dotage, I confess to enjoying scientific writing in a way that was scarcely imaginable when I was younger. My memories of those days suggest that writing was a hard slog. But things changed with time. For example, over 40 years ago, writing my PhD thesis was a Great Wall of China of a project – it rose up before me, impenetrable, monolithic, but nonetheless a task that had to be dealt with of necessity. And it was. It helped me to write science as a habit. Ahead of me were books and monographs to be written and/or edited, and always one more research paper, book review or conference abstract to write. It was the life in geological research that I craved from the beginning and enjoyed throughout. If writing was tough, then I faced it head-on as part of my research effort and did more than was required.

Yet I'm retired, so why do I keep writing? For the simple reason that, after many years, I found writing about geology to be fun. So, I just keep on having fun. It is a habit that gives me pleasure.

This preamble defines something of my philosophy of academic publishing. You know what I do, and how and why I do so. But let's turn the lens through 180°. What about you? I am always distressed that academic research and academic publishing are considered separate disciplines by some, perhaps many. Whatever the research, if it is not published, then it does not exist within its discipline. It remains undisclosed by the investigator, not widely known at all and, essentially, kept a secret from the wider scientific community. I fail to understand why.

When I was a research student in the early 1980s, such attitudes were possibly more widespread. There were still ex-students who would say that they had completed the research for a thesis without writing it up. No thesis, no degree. So, what was the point of the research if it was to remain unrecorded? Such 'scholars' always seemed to develop an individual slant to explain their failure to write. One I knew would not write a thesis until having filled ten field notebooks. After this the yjesis was still not produced. What was the point of it? Another I knew was forming a consultancy company which, to my knowledge, never got off the ground. And so on.

I must conclude that there is a mental state where writing to a purpose – a thesis and obtaining the research degree that was the original point of the exercise – is too frightening a task, whereas engaging in geology to no purpose – writing no thesis – placates the student. In the absence of a thesis the field notebooks or whatever can be presented as evidence of the candidate's industry, however ridiculously misdirected.

Nowadays, I am not obligated to produce publications apart from for my own satisfaction. This is a factor in my continued productivity; nobody is in charge, except me (Donovan, 2018, 2024). In truth, I enjoy guiding my own research and publishing endeavours. My decisions are entirely mine, with no annual report to deliver at the end.

I have been thinking about what I can suggest to help you publish both more successfully and more frequently. As a first step I recommend five possible behaviours that might engender good publishing habits. Not all of them will suit all authors, but some, at least, could be just what you need (see also Donovan, 2011, and 2017, pp.171–174). Further, I claim no great originality for my suggestions; in one form or another, most have been suggested before. But they have worked for me.

Write regularly, if only a paragraph a day. Hardly an original idea, but one that can be acted upon whatever the circumstances. Keep a notebook and pen/pencil in your pocket for the odd five minutes, wherever and whenever, when you might be able to scribble an idea or two. A colleague used to say write a page per day, at the end of a year you will have a book. True, but I am not suggesting anything more than a research paper. Yet a month of paragraphs will propel you closer to a complete paper; 30 paragraphs will break the back of most writing projects (except books). People do not write because they would rather make lame excuses (Silvia, 2007; Donovan, 2017, pp.179–181), but writing a paragraph does not require a major commitment of time. A paragraph every day is a small obligation that can pay big dividends. If you still have a lame excuse for not writing, do not come crying to me. To quote the inestimable Silva (2007, p.46), "*Saying that you can't write because of writer's block is merely saying that you can't write because you aren't writing. It's trivial. The cure ... is writing.*" Listen to the oracle.

Vary what you write – research papers, books reviews and conference abstracts, for example. Sometimes, writing an extended document can be wearing and a change of academic scenery is in order. Do not just stop writing, but temporarily change direction. Do stop writing that big research paper for now and pen something completely different, but shorter. (For example, Donovan and Paul (1985) was a diversion into a different subject while I was writing my PhD on fossil crinoids in 1983.) If you are reading a new and interesting book on your area of expertise, then write a book review; editors commonly welcome such unsolicited reviews. If you plan to attend a conference and contribute, then write your abstract or, better, two abstracts (a talk and a poster). If none of these entices you, then what will? You are allowed to use your own intelligence, experience and imagination at this point. Varying what you write can keep you fresh.

Have an annual target for your productivity. This works for some and not for others. A plan is a good thing providing it guides your endeavours, yet there are those who will make it an excuse to talk about productivity while remaining unproductive. I make a careful mental note of everything I might submit and publish during a calendar year without being too predictive on 01 January. Yet in any research post your HoD will want to know your plans. Make them both concrete and attainable as necessary.

Work with productive co-authors. There are co-authors and co-authors (Donovan, 2017, pp.105–108). You will find some will work for their recognition and others will expect it as a right. Encourage the first group and dump the second. Co-authors who are too important to contribute are not important enough to include. I had a work colleague with whom I might have published. Our interests were complementary, but hearing what happened with some of his other projects and his attitude to them was enough to discourage me. He seemed pleased to outline his collaborative disasters, even in his PhD thesis, and yet he was the one common factor in all of them.

Discover the more efficient journals in which to publish and, conversely, identify those slow journals to avoid. Be impatient to see your research papers in print. It once took a leading journal in my field six months to reject a short note of mine. I got a strong impression that the editor made his mind up and just wanted a couple of reviewers to agree with him, which they did in a half-hearted way. The journal in question has not been in receipt of many papers from me for the past 30 years. Yet the paper was published, elsewhere, in a journal that subsequently received many of my papers.

I do not think that any of the suggestions above sounds like too much hard work, yet, potentially, each may propel your academic endeavours forward. My mantra is not to sweat blood, but I do think that a little – I repeat, a little – and often is the underlying message. Plus make good decisions; move on from your non-productive co-authors and shun the unfriendly journals no matter how well both are thought of.

Let others encourage them, the fools. If you need to spend a day binge-writing every so often, then do so, but do not stop doing the simple things, too. A paragraph per day for a month will be more productive than twelve hours of a caffeine-induced frenzy.

In the final analysis, the more you write, the more will writing feel comfortable. It is a simple correlation. So, what is my point? It boils down to please publish and don't perish. Enjoy doing it. Write and discover what there is to appreciate in writing; I have. Write and publish whether it is a career obligation or just for fun. Find the journals that you like and who like you, and publish in them; make it a habit. In short, write and record your observations and ideas, preserving them for posterity; whatever, do not let them get lost like an unwritten PhD, but contribute. I look forward to reading your next paper.

References

- Donovan, S K, 2011. The sign of four. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, Vol.42, 382–386.
- Donovan, S K, 2017. *Writing for Earth Scientists: 52 Lessons in Academic Publishing*. [Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.]
- Donovan, S K, 2018. Planning for academic publishing after retirement. *Publications*, Vol.6, No.41, 1–4.
- Donovan, S K, 2024. Planning for academic publishing after retirement: some results and observations. *Publications*, Vol.12, 1–4.
- Donovan, S K and Paul, C R C, 1985. A new possible armoured worm from the Tremadoc of Sheinton, Shropshire. *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association*, Vol.96, 87–91.
- Silva, P J, 2007. *How to Write a Lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing*. First Edition. [Washington, DC: American Psychological Society.]



Notes for Authors



Where to Publish Stephen K DONOVAN

Swinton, Greater Manchester, UK

E-mail: SKennethDono@gmail.com

Abstract: You have just finished writing your latest paper, so where do you submit it for possible publication? The choice may be obvious or there might be several titles that fit the bill and each with a high profile. For any paper, choose the best journal to which to submit, but have a backup 'batting order' for submission, in case your initial submission is unsuccessful. Know your field. By all means submit papers to a favourite journal, but also spread your publications across a range of relevant titles.

Writing in science invariably has a purpose. It might be as simple as scribbles in a field notebook or a record of procedures in the laboratory. Either of these might be regarded as the starting point for your next research paper. Gather your data, make notes, develop these into sentences, paragraphs, eventually a complete document. I am glib, making it sound too easy (it isn't). The author needs to appreciate the nuances of the many aspects of academic writing (Donovan, 2017).

One aspect of academic publishing absorbed almost subcutaneously by most academics is where to publish. They know the leading journals in their subject area and ensure their contributions appear in them. For example, paper X is a contribution to subject Y. Contributions to Y might appear in a range of generalist and specialist journals. All may be worthy and the author must decide where their paper would fit most successfully, and be noticed by those who need to see them (remembering that your paper may, after all, be rejected).

Of course, I am not telling you where to publish; this is your decision. I cannot even help with an informed recommendation as I do not know your particular area of study. But there are relevant comments that may be of general applicability. Thody (2006, pp. 215–216) sensibly suggested that authors should aim for high-profile journals that are peer reviewed and are read by academics in your field. Also aim for publication in those journals with a wide readership. And "If rejected, you recycle down"; I know that I do. There is no sense in a rejected paper collecting dust in a drawer. Murray (2009, p. 37) hit the nail on the head in pointing out "You have to research the journals ..."; of course you do. Do not publish blind. Whatever, "... think first of [your] audience and the purpose of [your] communication" (Hartley, 2008, p. 138); your paper will likely fail to make an impact unless it is read by the target audience.

If you are working in a university, museum or similar research institution, chances are that your bosses expect you to submit to journals with a high profile, with a high scientific citation index (SCI) or satisfying similar metrics. There is certainly sense in this because both the author and the institution will benefit from the enhanced profile afforded to SCI journals. This scenario is familiar to many of you, I am sure. What I would like to explore are alternatives to this 'one publishing fits all' strategy.

A quick aside. I am assuming that your target journal loves your paper and wants to publish it. But what if it does not? In the words of Douglas Adams (2017, p.26, for example), "*Don't Panic*". Rejection is part of publication. See Donovan (2025) for my comments and ideas. Trust that some journal – after all, there are so many of them – is waiting to publish your paper.

This might sound like a glib comment, but consider the facts. In response to my bald query to the World Wide Web (www), "*How many academic journals are there?*", I got a response of 46,000 and growing [<https://publishingstate.com>]; others suggested yet more. How much choice do you need?

Obviously, most of these will be specialist journals completely irrelevant to your own interests, but not all. (It is a whim that will never be satisfied, but I would love to publish in the specialised medical journal with the euphonious title *Gut*.) You will probably know most or all of the alternatives. They will vary from those with stringent peer review policies to the more relaxed to those where the editor alone is judge, jury and executioner (Donovan, 2011).

Comments made by peer reviewers are, I trust, constructive and will likely help you to improve your paper, however good was your initial submission. If your paper has a positive review, these comments can propel you towards publication in your target journal. If your paper is rejected, constructive comments will help you to improve the submission (Donovan, 2025). At this stage, you have two jobs to undertake: improve your paper in the light of the reviewer’s comments; and target a new journal that will accept your resubmission. But which journal?

You would be a strange author if you did not already have a ‘batting order’ of preferred places to publish even before your initial submission. We all have places where we like to publish, such as *Cave and Karst Science*. But, for example, *Cave and Karst Science* may reject your paper; if it concerns, for example, karst geomorphology, then you need to seek suitable alternatives among the karst journals. To these may be added generalist journals in your study area, such as those that deal with geomorphology *sensu lato*, or geographically regional journals. Whatever, you have choices, so choose wisely.

I do not recommend resubmitting rejected, but revised, papers to the journal that first vetoed it unless encouraged to do so by the editor. Yet there are many other relevant journals to which you can send the revised paper and where it will not have a history. I have resubmitted to journals after rejection, but I needed to know that the resubmission was wanted. On one occasion I did so, thinking resubmission was encouraged, only to discover that the journal did not accept such ‘repaired’ papers; the editor’s rejection letter was ambiguous. It was a chastening experience and said journal has never received another paper from me.

Where to publish is a simple choice, for me at least. But I am out of the loop; in retirement I submit my papers where I like, not where the policy of an institution dictates. I subscribe to about half a dozen society journals, and most of these appear in

both hard and electronic copy. For preference, I publish mainly in them. I love to receive a printed journal through the letterbox and curl up with it. You cannot do that with online-only journals that, in truth, are not published for relaxed neo-amateurs like me; they are there for the professionals. Most of my target journals also publish some form of Gold Open Access for free, another influential plus point. My old age pension does not exist to fill the purses of shareholders of the big publishers. And in case one of my papers is not widely available, I am quick to respond to requests for pdfs.

Thus, where to publish has become a more personal choice. I like this. Coincidentally, my retirement coincided with the move to electronic-only publication of certain of my favourite journals to which I had both subscribed and submitted papers – even edited – for many years. In the absence of a hard copy, my separation from these journals was two-fold; I not only stopped subscribing to them, but I also stopped publishing in them. I feel sure that my views are in a minority, but they are my views.

But this move away from old favourite titles is positive in some ways. I have always recognised and supported the smaller journals produced by museums and small societies in addition to those of the big publishing houses. The latter are always popular with high citation indices, and receive enough submissions that editors can pick and choose what to publish. In contrast, the smaller journals have less submissions and less room for editorial manoeuvrability (Donovan, 2011). Today, I submit my best papers to these smaller journals, supporting their publication effort.

References

Adams, D, 2017 [first published 1980]. *The Hitch-Hiker’s Guide to the Galaxy*. [New York: Del Ray.]
Donovan, S K, 2011. Big journals, small journals, and the two peer reviews. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, Vol.42, 523–527.
Donovan, S K, 2017. *Writing for Earth Scientists: 52 Lessons in Academic Publishing*. [Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.]
Donovan, S K, 2025. Notes for authors: The positive side of rejection. *Cave and Karst Science*, Vol.52(2), 89–90.
Hartley, J, 2008. *Academic Writing and Publishing: A Practical Handbook*. [London: Routledge.]
Murray, R, 2009. *Writing for Academic Journals*. Second Edition. [Maidenhead: Open University Press.]
Thody, A, 2006. *Writing and Presenting Research*. [London: SAGE Publications.]

An explanation...

During 2025 a “Note for Authors” was misfiled and (worse) temporarily overlooked within the *Cave and Karst Science* editorial “system”. Perhaps poetically, its title was “*Things we all forget (sometimes)*”! The outcome is that two Notes are published above. For the benefit of readers who might wish to read or re-read the comments and tips offered within this series, the Table below lists the Notes to date – including (for completeness) one topic (red text) that was republished to help explain and emphasize the purpose and value of abstracts and conclusions.

Year	Series title and contribution sub-title	Volume (issue) page(s)
2021	Notes for authors: <i>The importance of a well-crafted abstract or what, exactly, are your conclusions?</i>	Vol 48 (3) 129
2022	Notes for authors: <i>Co-authors – Mainly good, only rarely bad or ugly.</i>	Vol 49 (2) 76–78
2022	Notes for authors: <i>What, if anything, is the purpose of the keywords?</i>	Vol 49 (3) 134
2023	Notes for authors: <i>Short notes and monographs.</i>	Vol 50 (1) 46
2023	Notes for Authors: <i>Writing an article for publication – some constructive suggestions for cavers, geologists and geomorphologists.</i>	Vol 50 (2) 93–95
2023	Notes for Authors: <i>The strength and importance of the reference list.</i>	Vol 50 (3) 135
2024	Notes for Authors: <i>The importance of notebooks.</i>	Vol 51 (2) 84
2025	Notes for Authors: <i>The importance of a well-crafted abstract or what, exactly, are your conclusions?</i>	Vol 52 (1) 39
2025	Notes for Authors: <i>The positive side of rejection.</i>	Vol 52 (2) 89–90
2025	Notes for Authors: <i>A reviewer complains.</i>	Vol 52 (3) 140
2026	Notes for Authors: <i>Things we all forget (sometimes).</i>	Vol.53 (1) 46
2026	Notes for Authors: <i>Making academic writing a habit.</i>	Vol.53 (2) 89–90
2026	Notes for Authors: <i>Where to publish.</i>	Vol.53 (2) 90–91



Photo Feature

The “Pearls of Wisdom”, Warren’s Self Respect Cave, Waitomo, New Zealand

John Gunn

In February 2026, when we received the paper by Garry Smith that features in this Issue of *Cave and Karst Science*, I was reminded immediately of the most fascinating cave pearls that I have seen. The “Pearls of Wisdom” (the name I gave them) are in Warren’s Self Respect Cave, one of the Waipapa Road Caves in the Waitomo District of New Zealand, where I undertook the research for my PhD. Originally photographed on 35mm slide film using an Olympus OM1 camera with a 49mm Zuiko macro lens; the slides featured were scanned commercially.

The top image of the set shown on the left was taken in September 1976, and includes most of the pearls within this “nest”. Below that, the other three images, taken in February 1976, show part of the same area at increasing levels of detail. A 49mm lens-cap included in the upper two images gives an indication of scale, but note that it is at a different location on each slide. Although I did not undertake any more-detailed research at the site, I suggest the following developmental sequence:

- (1) initial growth of the pearls was centred around nuclei comprising small grit clasts, by deposition of calcite from water saturated with calcium carbonate in an enclosed basin. At this stage the pearls must have been able to move freely, each forming a sub-spherical or elongate structure, reflecting the shape of its grit nucleus.
- (2) eventually the pool became filled with pearls, preventing their further movement and, as calcium carbonate continued to be precipitated from the saturated water, they became buried. This can best be seen on the right-hand side of the top image and the left-hand side of the second image.
- (3) subsequently there was a change in the water chemistry and unsaturated water flowed across, and/or accumulated in, the pool. Calcite was dissolved, exposing pearl nuclei, which – in some cases – have been removed completely. This is well-shown on the third image, where the nuclei are missing from most of the pearls, especially those in the lower part of the picture. Interestingly, the former nuclei are nowhere to be seen, suggesting that the clasts must have been eroded/transported away from the pool. Scaling from the lens cap, the two clasts just below the centre of image 2 are about 6mm in long axis (medium gravel) and the Hjølstrom curve indicates that a minimum velocity of $c.90\text{cm/s}$ is required to erode and transport clasts of this size. This suggests that, at some stage, there was a fast-flowing stream of aggressive water passing over the pearls.

One possible factor that might have triggered the change from deposition to erosion is that native forest was removed from the area and replaced by pasture around 50 to 75 years before the photographs were taken. This would have impacted on soil carbon dioxide concentrations, which are higher beneath native forest than under grassland (Gunn and Trudgill, 1982).

Sadly, just as this issue was going to press, I received news that the floor with the pearls has disappeared beneath a thin layer of mud, most likely washed down from the entrance during heavy rain. This emphasises the dynamic nature of cave processes!

“PhotoPhil” Round, of the Auckland Speleological Group, is thanked both for help with the original photography and for the update on the current situation”

Reference

Gunn J and Trudgill, S T, 1982. Carbon dioxide production and concentrations in the soil atmosphere: A case study from New Zealand volcanic ash soils. *Catena*, Vol.9, 81–94.