

**Patrick D. Ion**

Mathematical Reviews  
416 Fourth Street  
P. O. Box 8604  
Ann Arbor, MI 48107  
313-996-5273

**Helmut Jürgensen**

Dept of Computer Science  
Univ of Western Ontario  
London N6A 5B7, Ontario, Canada  
519-661-3560  
Bitnet: A505@UW0CC1  
UUCP: helmut@deepthot

**Alois Kabelschacht**

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik  
(Werner-Heisenberg-Institut)  
Fohringer Ring 6  
D-8000 München 40  
Federal Republic Germany  
(089) 31893-412

**Arthur Keller**

University of Texas at Austin  
Department of Computer Science  
Austin, TX 78712-1188  
512-471-7316  
ARK@SALLY.UTexas.Edu

**Donald E. Knuth**

Department of Computer Science  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305  
DEK@Sail.Stanford.Edu

**Gerhard F. Kohlmayr**

Mathmodel Press  
80 Founders Rd  
Glastonbury, CT 06033  
203-633-5659

**Gideon Koren, M.D.**

Hospital for Sick Children  
Toronto, Ontario M5G 1X8, Canada

**Charles LeHardy**

Summer Institute of Linguistics  
Box 8987 CRB  
Tucson, AZ 85738  
602-791-2272  
uucp: noao!azsil

**Pierre A. MacKay**

Northwest Computer Support Group  
University of Washington  
Mail Stop DW-10  
Seattle, WA 98195  
206-543-6259; 545-2386  
MacKay@June.CS.Washington.edu

**Rick Mallett**

Computing Services  
Room 1208 Arts Tower  
Carleton University  
Ottawa (K1S 5B6), Ontario, Canada  
613-231-7145

**Robert W. McGaffey**

Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc.  
Building 9104-2  
P. O. Box Y  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831  
615-574-0618  
McGaffey%ORN.MFEnet@nmfecc.arpa

**Laurie Mann**

Stratus Computer  
55 Fairbanks Boulevard  
Marlboro, MA 01752  
617-460-2610  
uucp: harvard!anvil!es!Mann

**Richard S. Palais**

Department of Mathematics  
Brandeis University  
Waltham, MA 02154  
617-647-2667

**Mitch Pfeffer**

Suite 90  
148 Harbor View South  
Lawrence, NY 11559  
516-239-4110

**Gil Pierson**

Computer Science Bldg  
Washington State University  
Pullman, WA 99164

**Arnold Pizer**

Department of Mathematics  
University of Rochester  
Rochester, NY 14627  
716-275-4428

**Craig Platt**

Dept of Math & Astronomy  
Machray Hall  
Univ of Manitoba  
Winnipeg R3T 2N2, Manitoba, Canada  
204-474-9832  
CSnet: platt%cc.uofm.cdn@ubc

**Pedro J. de Rezende**

College of Computer Science  
Northeastern University  
360 Huntington Avenue  
Boston, MA 02115  
617-437-2078  
rezende@corwin.ccs.northeastern.edu

**Yasuki Saito**

NTT Electrical Communications  
Laboratories  
NTT Corporation  
3-9-11 Midori-cho Musashino-shi  
Tokyo 180, Japan  
+81 (422) 59-2537  
yaski%ntt-20@sumex-aim.stanford.edu

**John Sauter**

801128 Bates Road  
Merrimack, NH 03054  
603-881-2301  
sauter@dssdev.DEC@decwrl.DEC.COM

**E. W. Sewell**

3822 Hillside Lane  
Garland, TX 75042  
214-272-0515 x3553

**Barry Smith**

Kellerman & Smith  
534 SW Third Ave  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-222-4234; TLX 9102404397  
Usenet: tektronix!reed!barry

**Ralph Stromquist**

MACC  
University of Wisconsin  
1210 W. Dayton Street  
Madison, WI 53706  
608-262-8821

**Rilla Thedford**

Intergraph Corporation, MS HQ013  
One Madison Industrial Park  
Huntsville, AL 35807  
205-772-2440

**Georgia K.M. Tobin**

The Metafoundry  
OCLC Inc., MC 485  
6565 Frantz Road  
Dublin, OH 43017  
614-764-6087

**Joey K. Tuttle**

I P Sharp Associates  
220 California Avenue, Suite 201  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
415-327-1700

**Glenn L. Vanderburg**

Computing Services Center  
Texas A & M University  
College Station, TX 77843  
409-845-8459  
Bitnet: X230GV@TAMVM1

**Samuel B. Whidden**

American Mathematical Society  
P. O. Box 6248  
Providence, RI 02940  
401-272-9500

**Ken Yap**

Dept of Computer Science  
University of Rochester  
Rochester, NY 14627  
Ken@Rochester  
Usenet: ..!{allegra,decvax,seismo,  
cmc12,harvard,topaz}!rochester!ken

**Hermann Zapf**

Seitersweg 35  
D-6100 Darmstadt  
Federal Republic Germany

## 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<sub>E</sub>X 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<sub>E</sub>X Driver** poses questions about standards that we need to address soon. Don Knuth created T<sub>E</sub>X 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<sub>E</sub>Xhax. The particular item I am most concerned with is the extensive use of magnification in the L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X and S<sub>L</sub>T<sub>E</sub>X 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<sub>E</sub>X 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.