

Rejection decision of DAE (6 December 2006)

From: Physical Review Letters (prl@ridge.aps.org)

To: zofiaropka@fizyk.instytut.serwery.pl

Data: 6 December 2006, 15:58:26

Temat: Your manuscript LQK1020 Radwanski

Re: LQK1020

Comment on "Nanomagnetic droplets and implications to orbital ordering in $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CoO}_3$ ": the origin of the excited state in LaCoO_3 by R. J. Radwanski and Z. Ropka

Dear Dr. Ropka,

The complete file concerning the above manuscript has been reviewed by a Divisional Associate Editor. The enclosed comments advise against publication in Physical Review Letters. The Editors accept this advice.

Your appeal has been considered, and our decision to reject is maintained.

Yours sincerely,

Reinhardt B. Schuhmann

Editor Physical Review Letters

Report of the Divisional Associate Editor - LQK1020/Radwanski 6 Dec 2006

I am reviewing this paper in my capacity of a Divisional Associate Editor. I have had access to the whole file associated with this submission and have read all of the correspondence. I have carefully read the submission and have formed my own opinion of it. This comment has been reviewed by two referees, both of whom recommended against publication in Physical Review Letters. I agree with their recommendation.

Comments in Physical Review Letters are not intended to right perceived wrongs. "Neither are Comments intended as a means to establish priorities or to rectify bibliographic oversights." (from the "Comments in Physical Review Letters" memo dated 3/01). Rather, Comments should add new information to the field. Both referees felt that Phelan *et al.*, the authors of the Letter being commented on, should have included at least a reference to the earlier theoretical work of Radwanski and Ropka, the authors of the Comment. I agree with the referees. Both felt that the Comment described the already published results of Radwanski and Ropka and did not present any new material. Hence the referees felt the Comment was not appropriate for publication. I agree

with them on this point as well. The two referees and I further agree that to justify publication, Radwanski and Ropka would have to show either that their previously proposed model could fit the new experimental results or that the model proposed by Phelan *et al.* was inconsistent with their data. The authors of the comment have not done either.

The editors have included two manuscripts with the correspondence sent to me. Both of these current manuscripts indicate that the field is well aware of the 2003 results of Radwanski and Ropka and the relationship of those results to the results of Phelan *et al.* These manuscripts add further weight to the recommendation against publication of the Comment.

In summary, I recommend against publication of the proposed Comment in Physical Review Letters because I believe that it does not present enough new information to be appropriate for publication in Physical Review Letters. The two previous referees and I agree with Radwanski and Ropka that Phelan *et al.* should have included a reference to the earlier work of Radwanski and Ropka, but that oversight by itself does not justify the publication of the Comment absent a significant discussion of additional new material.

Mark Stiles

Divisional Associate Editor Physical Review Letters

Comment of Radwanski: Despite of the rejection the DAE formulates very important statements in favour of Radwanski:

1. "Both referees felt that Phelan *et al.*, the authors of the Letter being commented on, should have included at least a reference to the earlier theoretical work of Radwanski and Ropka, the authors of the Comment. I agree with the referees." - **IT IS VERY NICE FOR ME!!!**

2. "The two previous referees and I agree with Radwanski and Ropka that Phelan *et al.* should have included a reference to the earlier work of Radwanski and Ropka," - **IT IS VERY NICE FOR ME!!!**

3. "I recommend against publication of the proposed Comment in Physical Review Letters because I believe that it does not present enough new information to be appropriate for publication in Physical Review Letters." - **IT IS UNSCIENTIFIC CONCLUSION because Comment does need to present new information but is obliged to present critics and corrections** (see memo of policy-prl).

Please see the following forms: Resubmittal Policy (PRL)

<http://forms.aps.org/author/resubpolicy-prl.pdf>

Request for publication of our Comment LQK1020

From: zofiaropka@fizyk.institut.serwery.pl
To: Physical Review Letters (prl@ridge.aps.org)
Data: 26 grudnia 2006, 21:01:16
Temat: from author LQK1020 Radwanski

From: Z. Ropka and R. J. Radwanski December 26, 2006
To: Editor of Phys. Rev. Lett.

Concerns: LQK1020 Comment on "Nanomagnetic droplets and implications to orbital ordering in $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CoO}_3$ ": the origin of the excited state in LaCoO_3 by R. J. Radwanski and Z. Ropka

Dear Editor,

We appreciate very much work of DAE, but publication of Comment is the scientific obligation of each scientific journal.

Let recall the summary of DAE, Mark Stiles: "In summary, I recommend against publication of the proposed Comment in Physical Review Letters because I believe that it does not present enough new information to be appropriate for publication in Physical Review Letters. The two previous referees and I agree with Radwanski and Ropka that Phelan *et al.* should have included a reference to the earlier work of Radwanski and Ropka, but that oversight by itself does not justify the publication of the Comment absent a significant discussion of additional new material."

Our main objection was the scientific critics of the origin of the excited state: **We claim that authors of the commented paper erroneously considered the excited state as the intermediate-spin state instead of the high-spin state** as we have proved in Phys. Rev. B 67 (2003) 172401.

The origin of the excited state in LaCoO_3 is by last 20 years the most important problem of LaCoO_3 , in particular after a publication of Potze *et al.* PRB 51 (1995) 11501 claiming it to be the IS state. So, its correction is very important information for readers of Phys. Rev. Lett.

We insist on publication of our Comment which criticizes and corrects a paper published in Phys. Rev. Lett., but keeping a friendly scientific tone.

Sincerely Yours,
Z. Ropka and R. Radwanski

Next rejection of the Editor

From: Physical Review Letters (prl@ridge.aps.org)
To: zofiaropka@fizyk.institut.serwery.pl
Data: 2 January 2007, 21:05:54
Temat: Your manuscript LQK1020 Radwanski

Dr. Z Ropka
Center of Solid State Physics
Code: LQK1020
Title: Comment on "Nanomagnetic droplets and implications to orbital ordering in $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CoO}_3$ ": the origin of the excited state in LaCoO_3
Authors: R. J. Radwanski and Z. Ropka

Dear Dr. Ropka:

Herewith we confirm again the editorial decision against publication of the Comment. The decision was made after consulting a Divisional Associate Editor who considered the full file of the manuscript. In your email you reiterate arguments that were accessible to the DAE and also to the reviewers. Nothing new is added to the discussion, while your manuscript has indeed been given the full consideration possible.

Your appeal has been considered again, and our decision to reject is maintained.

Sincerely yours,
Yonko Millev
Assistant Editor Physical Review Letters

Next request for publication of our Comment

(due to the importance of problem of the excited state in LaCoO_3)

From: zofiaropka@fizyk.institut.serwery.pl

To: Physical Review Letters (prl@ridge.aps.org)

Data: 3 January 2007, 20:43:26 Temat: from author LQK1020 Radwanski

From: R. J. Radwanski and Z. Ropka Krakow, January 3, 2007

To: Editor of Phys. Rev. Lett.

Concerns: LQK1020 Comment on "Nanomagnetic droplets and implications to orbital ordering in $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CoO}_3$ ": the origin of the excited state in LaCoO_3

by R. J. Radwanski and Z. Ropka

Dear Editor,

Thank You very much for Your yesterday answer Jan 2, 2007. However I am not satisfied with treatment of my Comment by the Editor. I am trying to be as much polite as possible, appreciating job of DAE, referees and the Editor, but WE HAVE RIGHTS to have own scientific view.

Publication of Comment is somehow an obligation of the scientific journal - otherwise Science goes in a wrong direction and can be manipulated. 5 years ago we have submitted a paper with novel interpretation of LaCoO_3 with the excited high-spin (HS) state instead of very popular intermediate (IS) state. The paper, introducing the (erroneously) IS state (Korotin *et al.* Phys. Rev. B 54, 5309 (1996)), has got enormous number of citations (almost 200 at present) with many, many of them in Phys. Rev. B and Phys. Rev. Lett. Our paper did not get appreciation of the referees and the Editor (similarly other our analysis of $3d$ magnetism - see for instance our troubles with the PRL Editor on NiO). The recent paper "LaCoO₃ - from first principles" LQ10665 submitted March 23, 2006 has been quickly rejected despite the long explanation in Notes to Editor.

In such situation we wrote a few Comments to papers recently published in Phys. Rev. Lett. One of them is the present Comment questioning an erroneous claim of the IS excited state (other BYK 1001,...). Recently, in meantime a Letter of Haverkort *et. al.* is published in Phys. Rev. Lett. 97 (2006) 176405 with a same claim by ours in this Comment, i. e. that the excited state in LaCoO_3 is the HS state. So, how we can make Physics in such a situation???

Getting Your subsequent rejection of yesterday we wrote and we just have submitted our subsequent Comment to a published Letter Phys. Rev. Lett. 97 (2006) 176405 - LAK1030.

Thus, we subsequently kindly ask to publish our Comment LQK1020 even together with referee reports, DAE and Editorial comments and so on. Working in Physics all of us have to follow scientific rules. You can have rights to reject papers which you do not like but publication of Comment is scientific obligation.

We would appreciate normal scientific cooperation without the need for us to submit next Comments to Phys. Rev. Lett.

Sincerely Yours,

R. J. Radwanski

With information to:

1. Editor-in-Chief M. Blume
2. President of American Physical Society

Final rejection

From: Physical Review Letters (prl@ridge.aps.org)

To: zofiaropka@fizyk.instytut.serwery.pl

Data: 8 January 2007, 15:26:48

Temat: Your manuscript LQK1020 Radwanski

LQK1020: Comment on "Nanomagnetic droplets and implications to orbital ordering in $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CoO}_3$ ": the origin of the excited state in LaCoO_3

Authors: R. J. Radwanski and Z. Ropka

Dear Dr. Ropka:

Your manuscript has been considered again. We regret to inform you that we have concluded again that it is not suitable for publication in Physical Review Letters. The earlier decision, backed up by the opinion of one of our Divisional Associate Editors, is upheld herewith.

Your manuscript has undergone a fair review according to the PRL guidelines. The decision to reject has been reached after consulting experts in the field. Moreover, the paper that is allegedly incorrect is, according to your email message of January, 4th, 2007, the one by Korotin *et al.* Phys. Rev. B 54, 5309 (1996). We appreciate this further elucidation. Among other things, PRL is not the journal to seek the publication of a Comment, published by another journal.

Once again, the earlier editorial decision on your manuscript holds.

Sincerely yours,

Yonko Millev

Assistant Editor Physical Review Letters