

General Delivery

From the President

Bart Childs

The last issue of TUGboat (Vol. 8, No. 1) represents a measure of success in my mind. The number of contributions, their content, and all other measures of quality made it interesting and useful. I hesitate to mention any one paper, but a number of people have commented about their high interest on several of the papers. Let's keep up the good work.

Several people have been spreading the good word about T_EX in national publications. We should publish a listing of these references soon.

Robert McGaffey's note in this issue (page 161) on the **Ideal T_EX Driver** poses questions about standards that we need to address soon. Don Knuth created T_EX to be portable, but the output drivers are of critical importance in making the system truly portable. I hope that we can have a significant session on this at the Seattle meeting.

Another topic that needs to be addressed is the use of fonts and magnification. It has been an active item in T_EXhax. The particular item I am most concerned with is the extensive use of magnification in the L^AT_EX and S_LT_EX worlds. The cm family has the needed fonts in 12 and 17 point sizes. Shouldn't we always distribute only magnifications 0, half, 1 and 2? Maybe one or two fonts should have a lot of magnifications for use in titles? Come to Seattle and be ready to argue the points.

One more topic of this type is that we need to make a concerted effort to discard the old am family of fonts. Does anyone have a good reason to keep them around? With the exception of the amssmc fonts, almost all have such a simple change that it seems past due.*

We are looking forward to meeting in the great Northwest. Dean Guenther and Pierre MacKay are coordinating the usual TUG sessions and the T_EX in the humanities sessions, respectively.

* Editor's note: We are pleased to announce that this issue of TUGboat has been set with the cm fonts resident on the Math Society's new Autologic APS-μ5 phototypesetter. These fonts are still being tested; however, testing should soon be complete, and they will then be made available from Autologic to other APS users.

Editor's note: The following item appeared in the *New England Journal of Medicine*, Nov. 13, 1986, and is reprinted with permission.

A Simple Way to Improve the Chances for Acceptance of your Scientific Paper

To the Editor: During the past few years we have witnessed a revolution in the way manuscripts, abstracts, and grant proposals are being typed. With improved typewriters and computer programs it is possible to produce manuscripts of typeset quality. It is generally assumed that data should be judged by its scientific quality and that this judgment should not be influenced by typing style.

I challenged this premise by analyzing the rate of acceptance of abstracts by a large national meeting. All abstracts submitted to the 1986 annual meeting of the American Pediatric Society and the Society of Pediatric Research (APS/SPR) appeared in Volume 20, No. 4 (Part 2) (April 1986) of *Pediatric Research*. Contrary to the practice of many other meetings, this volume also includes all the abstracts that were not accepted for presentation, and accepted papers are identified by symbols.

Abstracts were defined as "regularly typed" or "typeset printed." Each abstract was categorized as accepted if chosen for presentation or rejected.

A total of 1965 abstracts were evaluated. Excluded were 47 abstracts assigned for joint internal medicine-pediatric presentation, because the majority of them were submitted to the American Federation for Clinical Research, and there was no indication of their rejection rate; only those that had been accepted appeared in the APS/SPR book of abstracts.

Of the 1918 evaluable abstracts, 1706 were regularly typed and 212 were "typeset." The acceptance rate was significantly higher for the "typeset" abstracts: 107 of 212 (51.4 percent) vs. 747 of 1706 (44 percent) ($P < 0.05$).

Eighty-eight investigators submitted five or more abstracts to the meeting. Here, too, there was a higher rate of acceptance for the "typeset" abstracts (62 of 107; 57.9 percent) as compared with the regularly typed abstracts (184 of 451; 40.8 percent) ($P = 0.002$).

One may argue that investigators who can afford the new equipment for printing abstracts have more money and can afford better research, and therefore that their abstracts are accepted at

©1986 *New England Journal of Medicine*, reprinted with permission.