In some ways, the articles in this issue (all of which, perhaps coincidentally, are the result of double-blind peer review) relate to the question of how we provide access to the materials in our collections. I believe their variety underscores how many, if not most, of the challenges we face in the work of developing and preserving collections are, in essence, challenges of access. This is apparent, of course, when we discuss uncataloged backlogs, but I believe the articles in this journal help us see the “hidden collections” component of many other challenges as well.

E.J. Carter discusses what constitutes correspondence, how libraries and archives have provided access to it, and how they might do this in the digital age, as the very notion of correspondence itself seems radically altered. Joseph R. Nicholson examines the potential hidden collections formed by information found in personal libraries. He explores how large research libraries tackle the task of exposing this information with the challenges of size and scope these collections present. Finally, Melissa A. Hubbard and Ann K.D. Myers ask whether the “hidden collections” initiatives themselves have had any impact on rare book cataloging practices and they present ideas about how they have managed this effort in their institution.

I am also pleased to present the first reviews in our revived review section.

I continue to be grateful for the chance to work closely with authors, reviewers, the editorial board, and the staff at ACRL who make it possible to publish this journal. I welcome your feedback about any aspect of RBM.