

Re: editorial policy question

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-01/msg05409.html>

- *From:* "Jesse F. Hughes" <jesse@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 25 Jan 2007 08:34:39 -0500
-

lrudolph@xxxxxxxx (Lee Rudolph) writes:

Allan Adler <ara@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

drmwecker@xxxxxxxx writes:

Most of the better journals use double-blind refereeing, so,
in
practice, it should not come about that either of reviewer and
editor
knows the other party.

Thanks for pointing that out. You mean "reviewer and author", I assume.

I question strongly that "most of the better journals use double-blind refereeing" (if "better journals" refers to mathematics journals). I know of *no* mathematics journal that presently keeps the referee blind to the author (there were some experiments along those lines about 30 years ago, which failed and were stopped). I admit to never having refereed for the Annals, but I've refereed for other journals that seem to me to be among "the better", and never been blinded to the author. Perhaps drmwecker could give explicit examples of such journals.

I was wondering about that too. Double-blind is fairly common in philosophy, but not in computer science. CS researchers too often need to refer to their own past work and this gives pretty clear clues to who wrote what.

This can also be a problem in philosophy, of course, but in general, it's easier for the philosopher to write about a topic without setting the context to include his previous work.

Re: editorial policy question

Mathematics is, I'd think, more like computer science than philosophy in this regard. New work has to be put in context of old work and due to specialization, the author's previous work will be over-represented.

—

Jesse F. Hughes

"Mathematicians who read proofs of my results seem to basically lose some part of themselves, like it rips at their souls, and they are no longer quite right in the head." — James S. Harris, Geek Cthulhu

.