

to the Scope and Conclusions/Significance sections which are given in the Instructions for Contributors. Let us re-examine these points: the Abstract is to be brief and informative. It serves two primary purposes. It indicates to a reader the essence of the material covered and it is useful for bibliographical control purposes, e.g., for *Chem. Abs.* The abstract should not normally exceed about 50 words. The Scope (as well as the Conclusions/Significance) is to be written for the general reader. It is to provide the background to the study, i.e., why was it done, what is the relevance to the profession, what significant prior work is important, and how does the present work complement or extend the present state?

The Conclusions/Significance should tell the reader what results were obtained and why they are significant. With well written Scope and Conclusions/Significance sections, readers should be able to determine more readily why the work was done and of what importance are the results. Then

a reader may study the detailed paper if he or she chooses. A reader can always skip the front sections and read the paper directly, but surely, there are many fields where one does not want to read the entire paper but still wishes to keep abreast of new ideas and developments.

From the comments of many readers, it is ruefully concluded that the format has not been an unqualified success. Why? One reason is that authors balk at spending time and effort in writing lucid, interesting Scope and Conclusions/Significance sections. As noted previously, they still write for their peers and it is of less importance to them to tell their story to the general audience. Another reason is that most authors have developed a style which is not particularly articulate and conducive to descriptions which are simple and readily understandable; for example, the specialized jargon has become too deeply ingrained. The editor can be blamed for not enforcing strict standards. He has, however, tried many

ways. In one case, he cajoled his colleagues into reading *only* the Scope and Conclusions/Significance section of many papers and offering comments. While the suggestions tendered were invaluable, it took considerable time and could not be continued indefinitely. A professional rewrite specialist (from Union Carbide) tried rewriting several Scope and Conclusions/Significance sections of papers already published. The Editorial Board found the writing significantly improved, but in several cases, there were subtle changes in emphasis or interpretation which would have been rejected by astute authors.

No method has yet been found to insure satisfactory Scope and Conclusions/Significance sections and yet not unduly delay publication. The editor and most members of the Editorial Board feel that the Journal format is a step in the right direction. Implementation has, however, been far more difficult than expected. We encourage readers' comments to Dr. Ajinkya's letter and our reply.

ERRATA

The paper "Grouping of Many Species Each Consumed by Two Parallel First-Order Reactions," by Dan Luss and Sudhir V. Golikeri, *Journal* [21, p. 868 (1975)] has errors in equations 27, 28 and 36. They should read:

$$\frac{dy}{dz} = \frac{d\bar{B}}{d\bar{C}} = \frac{\alpha + 1}{M(t + \beta)} \quad (27)$$

$$\frac{\bar{B}}{\bar{C}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{k_i A_i(0)}{k_i + k_i^*} (1 - \exp[-(k_i + k_i^*)t])}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{k_i^* A_i(0)}{k_i + k_i^*} (1 - \exp[-(k_i + k_i^*)t])} \quad (28)$$

$$S(t) = \frac{\bar{B}(t)}{\bar{C}(t)} = \frac{I_B}{I_C} \quad (36)$$

The table of contents in the September 1975 issue of the *Journal* has an error. It should read A. S. Michaels and not A. J. Michaels.

In "Corotational Rheological Models and the Goddard Expansion," by R. B. Bird, O. Hassager, and S. I. Abdel-Khalik, *AIChE J.* [20, 1041-1066 (1974)], heading in 2nd column on page 1051 should read "Relaxation" and not "Relation".

Equation (7.2) should read α_1 and α_2 are functions of $t - t'$ as well as of the invariants of the γ -tensors; these invariants are to be evaluated at time t' .

Equation (8.3) should read

$$G_{II}(t - t', t - t'') = \frac{n_0 kT \lambda}{35} \left[24\delta(t - t') + \frac{9}{\lambda} g(t', t'') \right] \exp\left(-\frac{t - t''}{\lambda}\right)$$

The paper "A Generalized Thermodynamic Correlation Based on Three-Parameter Corresponding States" by B. I. Lee and M. G. Kesler, *Journal*, 21, 510 (1975) and "Erratum" 21, 1040 has an error in Eq. (15). It should read:

$$\left(\frac{\partial P_r}{\partial T_r}\right)_{V_r} = \frac{1}{V_r} \left\{ \dots + \frac{c_1 - 2c_3/T_r^3}{V_r^2} + \frac{d_1}{V_r^5} - \dots \right\}$$