

Re: Agendas

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2008-03/msg00122.html>

- *From:* ukastronomy <martin_piers_nicholson@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 5 Mar 2008 09:33:58 -0800 (PST)
-

The testament to your work is how much you've managed to publish in formal peer reviewed journals, despite many attempts to do so. And how much of your work is related to what marvellous thing you've done, rather than related to the topic at hand, and whether it is interesting.

It is all too boring to go through the rubbish that gets posted line by line. So just one example will suffice.

"Minor Planet Electronic Circulars (MPECs) are considered peer-reviewed publications, and the observers who contribute to MPECs are to be considered the authors."

Reference:–

http://www.as.arizona.edu:8080/Astro/steward/annrep01/Robert_McMillan.html

Why not have a look at the MPEC's for the following dates

2006 March 11th, March 20th, March 23rd, March 25th, April 1st, April 3rd, April 13th, April 17th, April 21st, April 29th just for starters.

Rather a lot of peer reviewed material in fact. So the truth of the matter is somewhat different – no surprise there then!

.