

PANEL DISCUSSION:

## TEX in Publishing

Siep Kroonenberg

Kluwer, Dordrecht

siepo@cybercomm.nl

### Panelists:

- Kaveh Bazargan (moderator), Focal Image Ltd. (UK)
- Fred Bartlett, Springer NY
- Jean-luc Doumont, JL Consulting (Belgium)
- Nadia Molozian, Harcourt Intl. (UK)
- Sebastian Rahtz, Oxford University (UK)

### Summary of views

Points raised during the day's panel discussion:<sup>1</sup>

- Nadia Molozian from Harcourt Publishers noted a strong increase in the use of L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X in production at her company. An advantage of L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X is that copy editing involves less work.
- Generally, L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X submissions by authors also appear to be up, although this is not true everywhere.
- Production of conference proceedings is a messy business; often, quick-and-dirty measures such as photographic resizing must provide a semblance of consistency.
- The publisher has little chance of influencing the coding style of monographies. Often, the author has been working on his book for years before a publisher gets his hands on it.
- An interesting speculation by Frederick Bartlett on why authors like to use bad L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X coding: writing is hard work; authors cast about for distraction and find it in fiddling with appearances.
- The same speaker encouraged the audience to complain to publishers about bad-looking books; this would give publishers an incentive to let their T<sub>E</sub>X specialists do something about it.

---

<sup>1</sup> This summary was first published in *MAPS*, the communications of the Dutch User Group NTG, Number 23 (1999), pp. 10–11, and appears by kind permission of the NTG editors and the author. This text is part of an overall summary of the TUG99 meeting, which appears in the same issue (pp. 8–12).