M. W. Evans, Ph.D., D.Sc.

Professor of Physics,
Department of Physics,
University of North Carolina,
Charlotte,
NC 28223,
U.S.A.

1 August, 1993,

Prof. A. D. Buckingham, FRS,
Editor, Chemical Physics Letters,

CPL 10909

Dear David,

According to my records, this is the thirty ninth communication regarding this article, which is a reply of mine to a comment by Laurence Barron. If I understand correctly, you originally sent me Barron's comment for refereeing and I rejected it. A reply of mine was drafted and submitted to you about seventh months ago as CPL 10909. You then decided to referee the original Barron communication with two further referees, and also to referee my reply. The referees made comments to which I have responded in full. Since then we have communicated some thirty nine times by fax and letter, and I have sent you two revisions of my reply at your request. My latest revision has not been sent to referee (1), but in your role as editor you have continued to comment on the manuscript. I have diligently replied to every one of these comments.

While acting as editor of CPL you have simultaneously acted as referee for the Journal of Molecular Liquids, and have rejected two of my papers to that journal, signing the referee's report. In doing so, you offered no scientific argument, but asserted a lack of "belief" in the theory. Also, Prof. Barron has rejected papers of mine to J. Molecular Liquids, in signed referees' reports, while simultaneously being in an adversorial role in other journals.

It has been pointed out to both Barron and yourself by two leading field theorists that Barron's $\hat{C}$ symmetry argument is incorrect. I have shown clearly the reasons why he is incorrect. Therefore there are no grounds for rejection of my papers. The reasons why Barron is incorrect are as follows. I give them here once again for reference.

1) My defining equation conserves $\hat{C}$. Nothing more need be said, this is a necessary and sufficient condition for conservation of $\hat{C}$.
2) The novel longitudinal field is a solution of the d'Alembert and Proca field equations of the U(1) sector, which conserves $\hat{C}$ in field theory.
3) Barron's diagrams have been described as meaningless by a leading field theorist, Prof. J. C. Huang. Considerations of the source are missing in Barron's diagrams, and it is quite obvious

that changing a radiating electron to a radiating positron reverses the signs of ALL radiated field components. Fields from matter and anti-matter mutually annihilate.

4) Both Barron and yourself have erroneously asserted that $\hat{C}$ changes the phase of transverse electromagnetic plane waves in free space. In fact $\hat{C}$ changes the amplitude, leaving the phase intact. The oscillating components simply change sign on application of $\hat{C}$ and mutually annihilate. This is the same conclusion exactly as for the longitudinal component.

5) It was shown in my first paper, Physica B, 182, 227 (1992), that the longitudinal magnetic field is directly proportional to the spin angular momentum of the photon, so that Barron's argument implies that the photon spin is zero, an erroneous conclusion.

Therefore I feel that I have more than adequately answered a very large number of questions from you as editor, and urge that you either publish both the comment and reply, as is normal practice, or refuse to publish either. Please note that all this has already been gone through once in Physica B, and that Barron's note to your journal is a trivial extension of his flawed argument to Physica B.

Good wishes,

Sincerely Yours,

Myron Evans.

(Dr. M. W. Evans)

Copied to interested colleagues.

Guidelines of the Optical Society of America Concerning Ethical Practices in the Publication of Research*

PREAMBLE

One of the ways in which the Optical Society of America serves the optics profession is by publishing journals that present the results of scientific and engineering research. The Society, through its editors as well as the membership at large, has the responsibility of establishing and maintaining guidelines for selecting and accepting papers submitted to the journals. In the main, the guidelines derive from the Society's definition of the journal scopes and from the optics community's perception of standards of quality for research and its presentation. The guidelines emphasize the ethical practices expected of persons engaged in the publication of research in Optical Society journals, specifically, of editors, authors, and manuscript reviewers. Publication of these guidelines reflects the conviction that the observance of high standards is so vital to the whole scientific enterprise that a definition of these standards should be brought to the attention of all concerned.

It is a basic policy of the Optical Society that all those involved in the publication process should give unbiased consideration to all manuscripts offered for publication, judging each on its merit as a contribution to research without regard to race, gender, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, political philosophy, institutional affiliation, and position of the author(s).

GUIDELINES

The guidelines concern original research papers, although many aspects are also pertinent for tutorial and review papers.

Obligations of Journal Editors

1. An editor should process manuscripts promptly.
2. The editor or topical editor to whom a manuscript is assigned has responsibility for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript. Responsible and prudent exercise of this duty normally requires that the editor seek advice from reviewers, chosen for their expertise and good judgment, with respect to the quality, reliability, and appropriateness of manuscripts submitted for publication.
3. An editor should respect the intellectual independence of authors.
4. Editors should avoid situations involving real or perceived conflicts of interest. Specifically:

   a. Editorial responsibility and authority for any manuscript written by an editor and submitted to the editor's journal should be delegated to some other qualified person, such as another editor of that journal.

   b. Unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations disclosed in a submitted manuscript should not be used in an editor's own research except with the consent of the author.

   c. When a manuscript is too closely related to the research of an editor and when there is a real or apparent conflict of interest, the editor should arrange for some other qualified person to take editorial responsibility for that manuscript.

5. The editor and the editorial staff should not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than those from whom professional advice is sought.
6. An editor should not reveal the name of a reviewer to someone who is not an Optical Society editor. However, after consultation with the editor, a reviewer may reveal her or his name.
7. If an editor is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance or conclusions of a report published in the editor's journal are erroneous, the editor should facilitate publication of an appropriate report pointing out the error and, if possible, correcting it. Preferably, this report should be an author-generated Erratum; if this is not possible, a Comment should be published.

Obligations of Authors

1. An author's primary obligation is to present a concise, accurate account of original research performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance.
2. A research paper should contain sufficient detail and reference to public sources of information to permit the author's peers to repeat the work. Adequate information should be provided with numerical data to permit comparison with other research. Specifically, data should include sources and magnitudes of uncertainties, and graphs representing numerical data should display error bars where appropriate.
3. An author should cite those publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work and that will guide the reader quickly to earlier work essential for understanding the present investigation. An author should also identify the source of all significant information quoted or offered, except that which is common knowledge. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, should not be used or reported in the author's work without explicit permission from the investigator with whom the information originated. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, should be treated similarly.
4. Any unusual hazards inherent in the materials, equipment,

or procedures used in an investigation should be clearly identified in the manuscript reporting the work.

5. Fragmentation of research reports should be avoided; brief reports in letters journals of incremental progress should particularly be avoided. Authors who have done extensive work in an area should organize publication so that each report gives a well-rounded account of a particular aspect of the general research.

6. The manuscript must contain significant new content not previously published or submitted elsewhere for simultaneous consideration. If related manuscripts are being submitted concurrently, the author should inform the editor of the relationship between the manuscripts.

7. Criticism, even severe criticism, of the published work of another researcher may sometimes be justified in a manuscript. When appropriate, such criticism may be made in a research paper, provided that it does not comprise a substantial fraction of the paper. Manuscripts that are predominantly criticism should be published as Comments with the opportunity for simultaneous publication of appropriate rebuttal. Both the Comment and the rebuttal should be reviewed. In no case is subjective personalized criticism considered to be appropriate.

8. The listed coauthors of a paper should be all persons who have made significant scientific contributions to the work reported. Other contributions should be indicated in a footnote or an Acknowledgments section. An administrative relationship to the investigation does not of itself qualify a person for coauthorship. The names of deceased persons who meet the criterion for coauthorship should be included, with a footnote reporting date of death. No fictitious person should be listed as an author or coauthor. The author who submits a manuscript for publication should accept the responsibility of having included as coauthors all persons appropriate and none inappropriate. The submitting author should attest that all others named as authors have seen the final version and agreed to its submission for publication.

9. Authors should submit responses to reviews and requests from editors promptly. In their responses, authors should avoid unsupported assertions and subjective comments.

10. It is an author's responsibility to submit an erratum for publication when a significant error is discovered in one of her or his published reports.

Obligations of Reviewers of Manuscripts

1. Inasmuch as the reviewing of manuscripts is an essential step in the publication process, scientists have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

2. A reviewer should act promptly, submitting a report in a timely manner. Should a reviewer receive a manuscript at a time when circumstances preclude prompt attention to it, the unreviewed manuscript should be returned immediately to the editorial office.

3. A chosen reviewer who believes that he or she is inadequately qualified to judge the research reported in a manuscript should also return it promptly to the editorial office.

4. A reviewer should recognize that a manuscript sent for review is a confidential document. Reviewers should not use or disseminate unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in an unpublished manuscript, except with the consent of the author. A reviewer may share responsibility for reviewing the manuscript with a colleague from the same institution. With this exception, the manuscript should neither be shown to nor discussed with others, except, in special cases, to persons from whom specific advice may be sought. In either case, the reviewer maintains the responsibility for ensuring confidentiality. The reviewer should inform the editor if others make significant contributions to the review.

5. A reviewer of a manuscript should judge the quality of the manuscript objectively and respect the intellectual independence of the authors. A review should be as constructive and helpful as possible; in no case is subjective personalized criticism appropriate in a review.

6. Reviewers should explain and support their judgments adequately so that editors and authors may understand the basis of their comments. Unsupported assertions by reviewers are of little value and should be avoided.

7. A reviewer should be alert to failure of authors to cite relevant work by other scientists. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument has been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation.

8. A reviewer should call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any paper submitted to or published in a journal or other widely accessible form of publication. The editor's attention should also be directed by the reviewer to any perceived fragmentation of publication by the author(s).

9. A reviewer should be sensitive to the appearance of conflict of interest when the manuscript under review is closely related to the reviewer's work in progress or published. If in doubt, the reviewer should return the manuscript promptly without review, advising the editor of the possible conflict of interest. Further, if the relationship between the reviewer and an author would bias judgment of a manuscript, then the reviewer should return the manuscript promptly without review.

10. After consulting with the editor, the reviewer may voluntarily reveal his or her identity to the author.

**These guidelines are based to a great extent on the "Ethical Guidelines to Publication of Chemical Research" of the American Chemical Society and "Guidelines to Publication of Geophysical Research" of the American Geophysical Union, which, in turn, is based on the American Chemical Society guidelines. The Optical Society of America appreciates the permission of the American Chemical Society and the American Geophysical Union to quote extensively from these documents.*