

More debate on information and the PIE proposal

(The following letters comment on our May article "Is Journal Publication Obsolescent?" by Simon Pasternack and our June series called "A Debate on Preprint Exchange" by Pasternack and Michael J. Moravcsik.)

Both Moravcsik and Pasternack seem to lose sight of the fundamental purpose of the exchange of physics information. Ideally a physicist would like to be able to communicate as rapidly as possible with colleagues throughout the world who have interests similar to his own. He would like to receive all recent literature that may be relevant to his own interests without any particular effort on his own part. He would not wish to be burdened with extraneous or worthless material.

A physicist receiving a journal usually finds himself with a large amount of material which is of no interest to him in his own narrow specialty. If he finds one article in ten that is of interest, he is lucky. More typically he will find only about one article in a hundred. Journals overload the physicist with large amounts of extraneous material (I, as well as others, have long since ceased to subscribe to *The Physical Review* because of this large amount of "junk" material taking up valuable shelf space.)

A journal article is usually published after a delay of six to twelve months. Quite often a physicist becomes aware of an article only after reading the abstract in *Physics Abstracts*, where another delay of six months may have occurred. In view of the fact that manuscripts can now be sent over the telephone by appropriate photoduplication processes and could, in principle, be made available within minutes after completion, a delay of many months or even a year or more seems inexcusable today. The ponderous methods of the physics journals do not meet the high-speed requirements of modern researchers.

The process of journal publica-

tion frequently filters out precisely the information that should be communicated. A request that space be conserved frequently makes an author condense his descriptions of experimental equipment or mathematical steps so much that they become unintelligible. Direct communication with the author then becomes necessary to recover the information that was filtered out.

Essentially all important contributions in some areas of research, such as electromagnetic-propagation phenomena, for which lengthy analysis is required, have been circulated "privately" as monographs, journals being completely inadequate to meet even the minimal information-exchange requirements.

The refereeing process used by some physics journals frequently eliminates interesting new ideas since the job of the referee is to see that a manuscript measures up to some standard, and the standard is necessarily based on that which is old and established and therefore not new. New ideas are frequently limited to minuscule steps.

In view of the marked discrepancy between the needs of the physicist, as ideally considered, and the performance of present physics journals, I would like to suggest an upgrading of Moravcsik's proposal as follows:


A central agency (such as the American Institute of Physics) would

receive manuscripts from authors, as well as reprints from the existing journals of the world. A physicist who wanted to receive certain select types of manuscripts (or reprints from established journals) would leave a standing order with the central agency for copies (microfilm, reprints or paper, as requested). The physicist could specify not only detailed areas of interest but also whether he wished to receive nonrefereed and rejected manuscripts (or perhaps nonrefereed and rejected manuscripts by selected authors).

Submitted manuscripts would be duplicated and sent out immediately to physicists who requested nonrefereed copies. At the same time the manuscripts could be refereed by one or two physicists chosen from a panel of experts in the specialized area of research treated. If the manuscript passed the referees, it would be distributed (after possible revisions) to physicists requesting refereed manuscripts. Reprints from established journals would be distributed as refereed manuscripts. A rejected manuscript, not withdrawn by the author, might be distributed to those requesting such manuscripts with the referees' comments included.

The panels of experts might be elected (by mail once every two or three years) from among physicists writing in particular areas of specialization, and their names would be published. (The system of secret referees should be as odious in a free society as secret informers who need not face the accused in a court of law. Referees hiding behind a screen of anonymity are frequently guilty of a supercilious attitude and of doing only a cursory job of refereeing.) A panel of experts whose names were known and respected should improve the quality of refereeing.

To finance the project and distribute manuscripts in an orderly and economic manner, recipients of manuscripts would pay according to the cost of the services they received. For example, they might be charged so



This 20-joule High-Q CAPACITOR has inductance of ONLY 1 NANOHENRY

- Q is 250 at 5 mc
- 0.1 microfarad
- 20 kilovolts



\$172

The Model ESC 247B coaxial disc capacitor is one of a series whose inductance is essentially that of the terminal.

Its coaxial construction results in maximum self-inductance of only one nanohenry for any capacitance from 250 pf to 0.5 ufd.

Capacitors in this configuration can be furnished in 50kv rating or, at lower voltage, to 500 joules. They can also be constructed to operate at high repetition rates.

The through-hole in the center of the terminal permits efficient installation of circuit components, such as the TOBE Model SBG-6 low-inductance spark-gap switch.

Ask for Bulletin EB365-20; it gives detailed information about the physical structure and electrical characteristics of coaxial disc capacitors.

And write or call whenever you have a requirement for energy-storage capacitors, discharge switches, pulse-forming networks, or low-impedance pulse lines.

LETTERS

(Continued)

much a page (perhaps ten cents) for a paper copy of a manuscript, and for journal reprints as determined by the journals themselves. If a recipient found that he was receiving more than he could afford, he could reduce the number of manuscripts sent to him. The recipient might also choose to receive only manuscripts of fewer than some maximum number of pages.

Any federal or institutional aid to the program would reduce the cost to recipients. Copies of manuscripts provided free to the central agency would also reduce the cost to recipients.

This system of distributing literature as it becomes available appears to provide as close to an ideal system of information exchange as is possible. It would probably encourage a greater exchange of information; more manuscripts might be handled per unit time than are now handled by journal publication. However, the total amount of paper used, or pages distributed might be far less than is currently distributed since "junk" material would not be distributed.

It would seem that the secondary problems of permanent storage and retrieval of such manuscripts (possibly bound according to subject matter) can be resolved. An abstracting service, such as *Physics Abstracts*, could publish abstracts of refereed papers and possibly just the titles of non-refereed and rejected papers.

The practice of measuring a physicist's worth by counting his publications could be continued if a manuscript passed by the referees were counted as a publication. (A rejected manuscript might be given less weight.) It should be noted that although the evaluation of a physicist in terms of the number of papers he can get by a referee is of interest, such evaluation is of secondary importance compared to the fundamental problem of maximizing physics-information exchange. A referee should not act as a complete censor with the power seriously to curtail or completely cut off certain types of information

exchange. The evaluation of manuscripts is time consuming and, if mandatory, it would seriously impede the proper flow of information. Each recipient physicist should be the best judge of what type of manuscripts he wishes to read; if he wishes nonrefereed manuscripts to save time, they should be made available to him without delay.

I recommend an expanded and upgraded PIE.

James Paul Wesley
University of Missouri at Rolla

I have appreciated the lively controversy in *PHYSICS TODAY* concerning document exchange vs journal publication, particularly the debate by Moravcsik and Pasternack in the June issue. (I agree with Pasternack's distinction between "documents" and "preprints." There is a real distinction between a bona fide preprint—of a manuscript to be published—and a document, which often is a preliminary report of work in progress and may be radically changed in publication or not published at all.) I would like to join Pasternack's side and present an argument that he omitted.

We already have a good system in operation for rapid publication of physics research work: namely, publication in *Physical Review Letters* of "Abstracts of Articles to be Published in *The Physical Review*." I just made a statistical study of the 33 abstracts published in the 20 June *Physical Review Letters*, to determine the time interval between receipt of the manuscript by *The Physical Review* and publication of its abstract. The average is 2.7 months, with quartiles at 3.2 and 2.4 months. The longest interval (I neglect the case of a revised manuscript) is 4.7 months; the shortest interval is 1.9 months. I submit that it is worth waiting 2½ months for an abstract of a publication, instead of developing a new system such as PIE, to obtain documents in, say, 1 month.

Of course, once the abstract of a *Physical Review* paper is published, any physicist can readily obtain a bona fide preprint of the paper by the simple expedient of sending a postcard to the author. There are three

TOBE
—DEUTSCHMANN—
LABORATORIES
CANTON, MASS. 02021: Tel. (617) 828-3366