



Stretch Your Dollar!

As your budget gets tight, every dollar needs to stretch further and further. Sometimes painfully far.

Call us.

We'll help you stretch your dollar in the right direction — the direction of value. At McAllister Technical Services we make equipment specifically designed for you — from our well-known Scanning Tunneling Microscopes, Tribological Systems, Chambers and Fittings, to our Electron Energy Loss Spectrometers, Catalytic Reactor Cells, Custom Hemispherical Analyzers, Crucibles and countless other custom-made Gizmos. Imagine, such exceptional quality for a price that will stretch your dollar further than you dream possible. Painlessly.

We'll make your dollar go the distance—guaranteed. Call 1-800-445-3688 for more information.

McAllister Technical Services

Manufacturers of surface analytical instruments and devices

West 280 Prairie Ave.
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814
FAX (208) 772-3384

Circle number 45 on Reader Service Card

平成7年度 基礎科学特別研究員 の公募について

科学技術庁と理化学研究所は、選抜して我が国の基礎研究を強力に推進するための平成7年度の基礎科学特別研究員を募集します。斬新な研究課題を自主的に進行できる若い在外の我が国研究家の応募を奨励します。

1. 採用予定人員/25名程度
2. 受入機関/理化学研究所
3. 募集分野/物理学、化学、生命科学(生物科学・農科学)、工学の各分野で、理化学研究所で高度可能な研究
4. 応募資格/平成7年4月1日現在35歳未満の値額な若く博士号取得者又はこれと同等の研究能力を有すると認められる者
5. 待遇等/
 - (1) 謝金/月額50万円程度(税金保険料、税込)
 - (2) 通勤費/交通(上限4万円/月)
 - (3) 住宅費/家賃の一部支給
 以上のほか、研究費として135万円/年程度
6. 契約期間/選抜して最長3年間を限度とし、毎年度所定の評価により契約更新
7. 応募書類の提出締切/平成6年6月15日(必着)

応募したい方は下記に平成6年5月31日(必着)に問い合わせのこと

(応募書類の領出締切/平成6年6月1日水)

理化学研究所研究推進部・基礎科学特別研究員制度担当

〒351-01 埼玉県和光市沢2番1号

電話 046-462-1111 内線 2461~2463

FAX 046-462-4608 (関係書 伝) 046-463-3687
8. その他/本件は関係予算の成り立ち等により、その事情により変更がありますので、その旨を御承知下さい

科学技術庁/理化学研究所

Circle number 46 on Reader Service Card

continued from page 15
do justice to the changes that have been made at PRL.

Incidentally, while the questionnaire results quoted in the report of the PRL review did give a C+ as the authors' view of refereeing, it should be remembered that PRL rejects 60% of the papers submitted, so there may be some tendency, for example, for authors to feel referees don't understand their work. The expert members of the review panel, in reading an unbiased sample of 148 files, gave grades of 98 good, 34 fair and 16 poor to the quality of refereeing. The expert panel also gave high marks to the final editorial decisions.

We have tried hard to involve the divisional associate editors in all stages of the review process. The total number of divisional associate editors has gone up from 31 prior to the report to 47. Despite the increase, the average work load of divisional associate editors has increased. We have not been able to send every paper to a divisional associate editor in all fields, as we do in particle physics and some other fields, but we have tried to learn the divisional associate editor's views on the choice of referees. Even an *ex post facto* opinion is useful, as it informs future choices. We have also worked in a variety of ways to learn the views of the divisional associate editors on the appropriateness of papers for PRL, including using the divisional associate editor as a first-stage "filter."

Rotating divisional associate editors more often is a possibility. However, there is a learning period, and there is substantial "overhead" in finding and appointing a divisional associate editor.

We have improved the time from receipt to acceptance since the review panel report by instituting the "one bounce" rule: Decisions are now made on papers after a maximum of one return to the author. An author can appeal a rejection, and this has increased the burden on the divisional associate editors. For the majority of papers, however, the rule has accelerated the process. The single biggest challenge to lowering (or even maintaining) the time to acceptance is the steady growth (about 8% per year) in submissions to PRL. This growth places an increasing stress on the resources available to PRL.

Finally, I would like to address the question of whether the editors should be working physicists rather than full-time editors. For a journal like PRL, which attempts to cover all of physics and which receives around 5000 manuscripts a year, we would need something like 20 to 30 part-time editors.

It would be very difficult to maintain the uniformity of standards among different fields under such conditions. The complexity of such an operation would be great for our organization (APS), devoted as it is to fairness and freedom from individual biases. Assuring that the full-time editors are current in their knowledge of the relevant physics (and physicists) is important. We address this first of all by our system of divisional associate editors and their close working relationship with the editors. Second, the editors maintain their contacts in physics by attending meetings, conferences, relevant divisional activities and so forth.

I think our system has worked fairly well. As Nauenberg points out, it could work even better, and we are trying to accomplish that.

JACK SANDWEISS
Physical Review Letters
Ridge, New York

11/93

In a recent letter Mark Azbel shows how peer reviewing probably would have stopped Columbus from getting to Isabella's front door. I think he is optimistic: Peer reviewing probably would have questioned his ability to walk or required him to fly.

The way I see it, there is really only one major problem with peer reviewing, and that is the anonymity. Not only should the identity of the referees be made known; they should appear on the published paper, perhaps even in the by-lines! This has a great many advantages. It would give the referees more reason to do their best, since they would like to see their names in print, especially after having slaved over a difficult paper. At the same time they would be much more careful, not wanting to be caught mandating garbage, and furthermore it would soon become clear whom an author should request to be excluded as a referee.

I seriously believe that this whole matter should be put to a vote in some form or other to all members of the APS, and that perhaps a revised form of refereeing should be implemented for all journals published by the American Institute of Physics.

WALT DE HEER
Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne
7/93 Lausanne, Switzerland

Correction

February, page 89—The line "Not with a bang but a whimper" is from T. S. Eliot's "The Hollow Men." ■