COMMENTS

NT/F MANUSCRIPT REVIEW POLICIES

We are currently attempting to expand our files of reviewers so that more in-depth coverage of the wide variety of areas covered by *Nuclear Technology/Fusion (NT/F)* is possible. Qualified readers interested in serving as reviewers who have not yet been contacted are encouraged to write me.

It may be of interest to readers and authors alike for me to briefly discuss the peer review policies currently practiced by *NT/F*. Along these lines, an interesting recent editorial "Peer Review-Reviewed" by Don Christiansen on p. 21 of the August 1981 *IEEE Spectrum* is noted. In this editorial, the practices of some 26 different editors of various IEEE journals are reviewed. Practices vary drastically among these journals, and those of *NT/F* appear to fall somewhere in the "middle road." Indeed, for comparison, the remainder of the present comment addresses issues raised in the *Spectrum* article in the order discussed there.

Two referees are solicited for all technical articles or notes in *NT/F*. The objective is to obtain two thorough reviews with recommendations that agree. A third review may be sought in the case of a tie vote or where one of the initial reviews appears superficial. In cases of extreme controversy, e.g., if the author appeals the conclusion of the first review, more than three reviewers may be used.

The cadre of reviewers is built in a variety of ways to assure the objective of obtaining qualified experts of stature in the area of the article. For each article reviewed, persons are selected from *NT/F* reviewer files organized by specific areas of interest and background of the reviewer. Sources include authors of key references cited in the manuscript and members of various professional and national committees.

The names of reviewers are not revealed to authors, hence credit is not given on a case-by-case basis. However, it is the intent of *NT/F* to periodically publish a list of reviewers (with prior permission from reviewers) in order to recognize the importance of their contributions to the journal.

Reviews are forwarded to the authors for the most part without editing, although sometimes extraneous material may be removed. Consequently, *NT/F* reviewers might consider the request of the editor of the *IEEE Trans. on Power Engineering* who suggests that referees be "courteous and tactful." (*NT/F* does not follow the practice of the several transaction editors who remove insults from reviews!) However, the editor of *NT/F* retains the right to add remarks or emphasize points raised by reviewers when this seems

appropriate. In cases where additional reviewers are used to settle controversies, these reviewers are sent copies of the original reviews as additional background. Telephone reviews will normally not be accepted although under unusual circumstances (e.g., a reviewer is on an extended trip and cannot secure typing services) the *NT/F* office is prepared to make transcriptions of phone comments. Copies of all reviews are retained on file for one year after publication (or rejection) of the manuscript. In case one of the editorial staff is involved in some way with work submitted for publication, processing of the manuscript is turned over to another member of the staff (or to the editor of another ANS publication) so that the anonymity of the reviewers is strictly guarded. Since timely reviews are essential to avoid unnecessary delays in publication, reviewers are requested to inform the editor if problems develop. Telephone reminders are used after a reasonable time has elapsed.

Standard forms are sent to reviewers to provide some common criteria for judgment. A copy of this form, along with other forms used to instruct persons writing meeting summaries and book reviews, is included in the Departments section of this issue of *NT/F*. It might be noted that the editor reserves the right to exercise some judgment over such items as Book Reviews, Meeting Summaries, and Letters to the Editor, particularly with respect to appropriateness and length.

In conclusion, I believe that to date these procedures are working to the satisfaction of all concerned. For the most part, *NT/F* reviewers have demonstrated objectivity and have generally devoted considerable time and effort to the task. In contrast to R. Shea's comment in the *Spectrum* article that all too often a reviewer attempts "to show that he knows more about the subject than the guy who wrote the paper in the first place, resulting in nit-picking," *NT/F* reviewers have frequently been complimented by authors for their constructive help. Thus, I feel strongly that the review procedures employed by *NT/F* are important in order to ensure the high standards of the journal. Again, I thank reviewers for their continued help in this matter. On the other hand, the ultimate responsibility for an article resides with the author and he must not be lulled into a feeling that reviewers will catch all errors. On the contrary, the reviewer serves to set basic standards and to provide a "sounding board" for the clarity of concepts presented in the manuscript. It remains the author's responsibility to ensure that the article contains the outstanding work that we all hope to find in *NT/F*. He is the one whose reputation rises (or falls) with the reception given the article by the technical community.

SPECIAL SECTION

This issue of *NT/F* includes a special section that contains five papers from a recent National Science Foundation (NSF) policy workshop on "International Collaboration in Fusion Energy Development." Further background about the purposes and organization of the workshop are presented in the Preface to the special section prepared by Dr. KunMo Chung, who organized the workshop for NSF. While these papers are not technical in the strict sense of the usual articles in *NT/F*, they are presented here because of the extreme importance that international collaboration has assumed and continues to play in the development of fusion. Indeed, the United States, Japan, the Soviet Union, and the European Community, all of whom are heavily involved in fusion research, are facing severe monetary limitations due to the increasing costs for large experiments, the long-term nature of fusion development, and global inflation/recession economics. Thus, the motivation to share costs through international collaboration is perhaps stronger today than ever before. On the other hand, as brought out in several papers in the special section, as fusion approaches its goal of a

commercial product, nationalistic concerns pose a growing roadblock to collaboration. Even now there is an increasing concern among the industrial nations who compete in the international market that such collaboration may "give away" data related to subsystems in fusion devices that are immediately relevant to other high technology fields. The special section in this issue provides a unique insight into this complex situation, which is clearly a crucial factor in the time scale for fusion development.