Thank you for fine-tuning this one more time. It seems fine. I add three comments (A, B, C) below.

A.

~~4.6 g) newspapers and periodicals intended mainly for people who are not professional biologists, abstracting journals, trade catalogues, and seed exchange lists;~~

4.6 g) publications not intended for academic communications, such as etc.

B.

I agree with James Doyle

[Contrary to Sean, I think it’s a good idea to err on the side of caution and not accept names proposed only in electronic supplements. I really worry that such supplements will be more ephemeral than the main articles, even though they often include material (like actual data) that will be more useful to readers 100 years from now than the outdated prose in the main text. I also suspect that the peer review of supplements is all too often negligible.]

These are meant to be published for future investigators and students. Some safeguards to make sure it is a safe and reliable avenue “for a long time” ought to be necessary.

C.

5. Publication date.

I won’t go on about this one. I know I’m at odds with most reasonable people. As far I can see, practically, any paper published within one quarter of a year is simultaneous publication these days.

Some publish preprints once accepted within a day, others linger in a publication queue for months before they appear. They may both have been accepted the same day.

And then there are time zones, etc. Rather than go to the nearest second, I would step back. Conflicts have been rather rare (in my field) they can be sorted out when they occur, if ever. I can think of one occurrence since 1990. And very rare prior to that.