

COMMENTS



The response thus far to *Nuclear Technology/Fusion* (NT/F) has been enthusiastic. A number of research papers have been received and are in the review process. However, authors do not yet appear to appreciate the advantages of the Technical Notes section. I fear that some view these Notes as being of lesser importance than the full articles. This simply is not the case. Technical Notes are for important results that the author wishes to publish quickly. A strict review process is still used, but every effort is made to expedite the process. Since Notes are roughly a third the length of a full paper, they can often be “squeezed” into issues at the last minute. However, reviewers are asked to reject Notes *unless* the results are sufficiently important to justify fast publication. Consequently, I anticipate a higher rejection rate for Notes. In this sense, the Technical Note route carries a certain prestige that is analogous to publication in *Applied Physics Letters* [see, e.g., the discussion in *Science*, **210**, 1337 (1980)].

Letters to the Editor are also important but little used in many journals. I am pleased that letters illustrating the use of this avenue for communication were sent in for this issue. Clearly, the question pinpointed by Dr. Mujid Kazimi concerning the safety-radiological analysis of fusion plants is one that the fusion community should focus on and attempt to resolve in the near future. I hope readers will continue to pick out such issues in NT/F articles and take advantage of the Letters column for this purpose. Letters are not reviewed but the editor reserves the right to judge their appropriateness for publication.

George Miley