

EDITORIAL

A physicist told us the other day that he liked Physical Review Letters because "he could read it all." He did not mean that he understood it all, but that its size makes it possible to learn what is being done in various fields of physics. We believe that this is important and that it is therefore the editor's duty to limit the number of Letters in each issue. We are obliged to send to referees many of the submitted Letters to ascertain whether their contents require rapid publication, thereby occasionally causing a delay. More serious delays result, however, when we have to return a manuscript to the author because it is improperly prepared. When figures cannot be reproduced clearly, when formulas and symbols are undecipherable, it is no longer significant that the subject matter deserves speedy publication.

S. A. Goudsmit

In the Errata in this issue, we reprint in full a Letter of P. Franken, R. Sands, and J. Hobart from the issue of July 15 [Phys. Rev. Lett. 1, 52, (1958)]. (The reference in footnote 1, to a "following Letter", is to the one that followed in the original issue.) A transposition of material in the page make-up process left this Letter rather badly garbled, and the error was not caught in proof-reading. The confusion was such that it