

**CHALLENGE of PHYS. REV. LETT.  
on "Orbital moment in NiO"**

Krakow, 20.03.2000

R. J. Radwanski  
Center for Solid State Physics

**Editor-in-Chief of Phys. Rev. Lett.  
Dr Martin BLUME  
and Editor of Phys. Rev. Lett.  
dr G.Wells  
and Editor of Phys. Rev. B  
dr Adams**

concerns: LF7313, Orbital moment in NiO,  
LN6596 Jahn-Teller effect formation  
LC7763 Local off-cubic distortion ..  
LE6925 Relativistic effects in the ..

Dear Dr Blume,

Thank you for your letter of March 7, 2000 with the negative decision about my a/m papers and with information about a special policy undertaken to my person and my papers.

What I can do with this new kind of the censorship? Not so much - it is your scientific responsibility. However, please let know my viewpoint:

1. I have been put in the situation that my scientific view on the magnetism and electronic structure is not only accepted but hostilely rejected. It is not normal situation as in Science different points of view are printed and openly discussed.

2. I highly appreciate the role of the referee in the publishing procedure but the referee cannot reject a paper because it presents scientific view different from his one. Moreover, he is not taking responsibility for his rejection.

3. Thus let know that **I challenge your referees** (34 + DAEs) and consequently the presently-in-fashion understanding of 3d-ion containing compounds (also for 4f/5f compounds - in another procedure).

I assume that you take the full responsibility for your decision. Please specify how I can require this responsibility from you and from the Editor of PRL and PRB in the future. To make your responsibility a little bit real please publish your decision together with the titles of my rejected papers. It will be 1-2 pages in PRL in total (I can pay for it). It will mark the present fact for the future and then we leave the problem

for next physicists.

Your decision is somehow bad for me - but it is not so much - I suppose that I deal with people who take the full responsibility for their decision and consequently **undertake the scientific bets for 1 million dollars** (dr Walle, dr Sandweiss, ...). By it I am quite satisfied and hereby I confirm that I treat these bets seriously. I am ready to make it with other also - but I think it is enough already. Thus, I am convinced that your decision is very bad for Science and for Phys. Rev. Lett./Phys. Rev. B in particular. Thus, I ask you to reconsider your decision. But obviously you will do what you think. With the full responsibility, of course.

I maintain that the treatment of my papers in PRL/PRB is unfair. The Editor (of PRL and PRB) did not conduct the referee process to reveal the scientific clue of the scientific controversy. It is scientifically unfair to reject the paper due to another point of view in situation when the problem is not solved and/or is still a subject of the hot undergoing discussion (e.g.  $\text{LaCoO}_3$  is discussed recently in: PRB 60 (Dec. 1999) 16423 - I cannot write about it in my papers: LN6596, LC7763 and LE6925; also  $\text{LaMnO}_3$  is discussed PRB 61 (Jan 2000) 1324, my papers LE6925 and, not mentioned here but submitted 3 years ago, BZR586, LA6567 are not of wide interest. Funny!!!).

Dear Editor,

please note that each referee presents more or less different views and reasons for rejection. For instance, I have reports that reject my paper from the contradicting reasons. Nonsense, but it is (I can understand it - as it shows the present inconsistent understanding of the subject of the 3d-magnetism). Moreover, **I never get the answer to my simple question about the referee report of LF7313 where the orbital moment has been calculated.**

Concerning the future please know that I will submit next papers to PRL - I assume that PRL has the best referees in the world. I am ready to challenge them, if they wish.

In conclusion, I ask you to reconsider your negative decision about my a/m papers and please start the normal scientific procedure in PRL/PRB with my papers. Your referees it is your problem, not mine. To express my point to the end: I personally prefer you to maintain your negative decision - but please take the full responsibility for it. The real one. And please inform me about your real responsibility.

Looking forward hearing you,

Sincerely Yours,

R. J. Radwanski and Z. Ropka

# The American Physical Society

EDITORIAL OFFICE  
1 RESEARCH ROAD, BOX 9000  
RIDGE, NEW YORK 11961-9000

MARTIN BLUME  
Editor-in-Chief

Telephone: (631) 591-4000  
Fax: (631) 591-4275  
Internet: blume@aps.org

March 23, 2000

Dr. R. J. Radwanski  
Center for Solid State Physics  
sw. Filip 5  
31-150 Krakow, POLAND

Dear Dr. Radwanski:

In regard to your email and letter of March 20th, we do not and will not publish anything in our journals concerning rejected papers. The policy we have stated regarding your papers, described in my letter to you of March 7th, followed careful consideration. I note that more than once in correspondence you have expressed the opinion that Physical Review has the best referees in the world. Accordingly, I urge you to consider again the opinions and advice of the many distinguished referees who have volunteered their time to review your papers. Much effort has gone into the reviews and appeals of your papers, and I regret that we cannot respond to any further correspondence on these matters.

Sincerely,



Martin Blume  
Editor-in-Chief

MB:po

**SUBMISSION HISTORY**  
**of "Orbital Moment in NiO "**  
**in Phys. Rev. Lett. in years 1999 – 2000**

**computer PRL query - 09 Dec 2005**

**CODE:** LF7313

**JOURNAL:** Physical Review Letters

**RECEIVED:** 08Jun99

**SECTION:** (I-7) Condensed Matter: Electronic Properties, etc.

**TITLE:** Orbital moment in NiO

**AUTHOR(s):** Radwanski,R.J. / Ropka,Z. / Michalski,R.

**PACS:** 75.10.Dg 75.30.Gw

**ADDRESS:** Dr. R.J. Radwanski  
Center for Solid State Physics  
sw. Filip 5; 31-150 Krakow, POLAND

**PHONE:**

**FAX:** 011-4812-6336146

**E-MAIL:** sfradwan@cyf-kr.edu.pl

Please check all of the above information carefully. (To send us corrections  
or updates click [here.](#))

**CURRENT STATUS OF MANUSCRIPT:** With author(s)

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

**SENT RECEIVED DESCRIPTION**

19Jul01	Communication (miscellaneous) received from author
28Sep00	Correspondence (miscellaneous) sent to author
25Sep00	Communication (miscellaneous) received from author
29Aug00	Communication (miscellaneous) received from author
28Aug00	Editorial decision and/or referee comments sent to author
25Jan00	22Aug00 Ed. decision and/or ref. comments to author; response rcvd
17Aug00	Communication (miscellaneous) received from author
23Mar00	Communication (miscellaneous) received from author
07Mar00	21Mar00 Ed. decision and/or ref. comments to author; response rcvd
07Feb00	07Mar00 Sent on appeal; report received

01Mar00      Reminder to referee [others sent (not shown) at 1-2 week intervals]

    17Feb00 Communication (miscellaneous) received from author

    02Feb00 Communication (miscellaneous) received from author

12Jan00 19Jan00 Review request to referee; report received

01Dec99 12Jan00 Sent on appeal; report received

    12Jan00 Communication (miscellaneous) received from author

23Dec99      Reminder to referee [others sent (not shown) at 1-2 week intervals]

    14Dec99 Communication (miscellaneous) received from author

22Nov99 24Nov99 Ed. decision and/or ref. comments to author; response rcvd

    19Nov99 Communication (miscellaneous) received from author

26Oct99 18Nov99 Sent on appeal; report received

17Nov99      Reminder to referee [others sent (not shown) at 1-2 week intervals]

    11Nov99 Communication (miscellaneous) received from author

19Oct99 21Oct99 Ed. decision and/or ref. comments to author; response rcvd

    20Oct99 Communication (miscellaneous) received from author

15Oct99      Reminder to referee [others sent (not shown) at 1-2 week intervals]

23Sep99 15Oct99 Review request to referee; report received

21Sep99 04Oct99 Review request to referee; report received

06Aug99 15Sep99 Ed. decision and/or ref. comments to author; response rcvd

09Jul99 03Aug99 Review request to referee; report received

02Aug99      Reminder to referee [others sent (not shown) at 1-2 week intervals]

13Jul99 27Jul99 Review request to referee; report received

    08Jul99    Communication (miscellaneous) received from author