

LIQUID NITROGEN USERS

Investigate CRYOGENICS, INC.

LN₂

AUTOMATIC LEVEL CONTROLLERS

WHY

- Modular Components with complete interchangeability
- No calibration or adjustments required
- Standard Probes in use in Nuclear Environments
- Eight different Models available for use with virtually all types of LN₂ Storage Systems
- Transfer Line Assemblies and Components available
- LN₂ Solenoid Valves from 3/16 to 2 inch orifice and 25 to 225 PSI service available

Multiple Station distribution and Control Systems available.
STANDARD Probes available for NRC & CVC Traps



For complete details request Bulletin LN104A

CRYOGENICS, INC.

SUBSIDIARY OF
INTERNATIONAL CONTROLS CORP.

88 CLINTON ROAD
FAIRFIELD, N. J. 07006
(201) 226-9200

Agents in all principal cities, foreign and domestic

LETTERS

tant biological reactions are actually *accelerated* by freezing rather than slowed down as expected. Although the mechanism for this acceleration is not fully understood at present, it is not difficult to construct models in which ice acts as a catalyst for various "geometrical" reasons. Since the preservation of an organism over an extended period would presumably require freezing rather than simply cooling it, the problem of deterioration by ice-catalyzed reactions must be added to those already mentioned by Feinberg. In the spirit of his article, however, this problem does not seem insurmountable.

Ephraim Fischbach
University of Pennsylvania

Reviewer and author anonymity

Moody L. Coffman's letter (PHYSICS TODAY, November, page 12) contains two suggestions for change in editorial policy of scientific journals: either making the writer of an article as anonymous as the reviewer has traditionally been or revealing each's name to the other. The first alternative may sound attractive, but in practice it succeeds only a small fraction of the time. Despite removal of author and institutional affiliation from a manuscript, no phenomenal deductive powers are required, for example, to guess the authorship of an article that begins, "Earlier work (Coffman, 1962, Coffman and Moody, 1965) has shown . . ." The *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, for which I occasionally review, indeed experimented with this scheme last year but quickly abandoned it.

The other proposal, though, is not only more workable but, it seems to me, eminently fair. If one is to pass unfavorable judgment on a scientific article, one should do so as an individual and not as an anonymous godlike censor. If a reviewer feels an article to be poorly conceived, sloppily executed or incoherently reported, he surely should be able and willing to support his views.

Of course objections immediately

pop to mind. One is that some authors simply can not see defects in their work even when these shortcomings are spelled out in exquisite detail and will tend to embroil reviewers in lengthy but nonrewarding exchanges of letters. However, the reviewer might be able to feel a warm glow from the knowledge that he rescued the editor from such exchanges.

A second objection is recognized by Coffman, who mentions the problem of keeping friends. Alas, it is quite true that a good reviewer may make some enemies at times. Nevertheless I believe that good writers and reviewers can maintain friendship despite interchange of criticism. Besides, in the last analysis, which is more important—friendship or truth?

W. Dixon Ward
University of Minnesota

Moody L. Coffman suggests that articles be sent to reviewers anonymously. This is an excellent idea and has been proposed many times. Unfortunately it is impossible. Removing the name and affiliation of the author does not make a manuscript anonymous. A competent reviewer can tell at a glance where the work was done and by whom or under whose guidance. One must also remove all references to previous work by the same author, all descriptions of special equipment and other significant parts of the paper. Nothing worth judging or publishing would be left.

S. A. Goudsmit
Managing Editor,
American Physical Society

A correction

I would like to call your attention to two small historical mistakes in your September issue.

On page 45: It was not Marcel de Broglie, but Maurice de Broglie, who attended the Solvay Congress.

On page 121: Georges Lemaître did not go to Louvain to study humanities. The Collège du Sacré-Coeur is in Charleroi, where Lemaître was born.

C. Courtoy
Namur, Belgium

The editors apologize for the mistakes, both of which were their own. □