

Reynolds & Rajter paper, comments.
September 15, 2006

Reviewer #1:

I don't know if the Journal should proceed with this one. I thought that Kevin Ryan's paper should be split into two papers, but after a quick look at this one, I think it would have to be split into about 50 papers. Long sections are just a long string of assertions and non-sequiturs. He makes a wide variety of points about witness testimony and airline database anomalies and lack of wreckage. **None of these are covered in a methodical and considered way. There are no references whatsoever beyond embedded links to dubious websites. The paper is poorly organized and skips back and forth from subject to subject.**

The best hope from my perspective would be to take Rick's appendix and try to make that into a paper. In this case at least Rick has taken a single interesting and important question and tried to follow through and document his points.

The best I could suggest is to ask for revisions of the appendix to be published as a paper in its own right.

I have a little experience with image processing - enough to know that I'm not qualified to review Rick's analysis. Ideally I would recommend that this, or anything else involving this kind of minute frame-by-frame analysis, be reviewed by a qualified expert in image analysis. You should understand photogrammetry and in some cases you have to take into account quirks of the particular camera and lens being used - there are lots of pitfalls.

Why not publish a suitably revised version of the appendix as a paper in its own right?

The best I could recommend is that they try to pull out one particular point or issue that they think is strongest and write a paper that really covers that one point.

As it stands, I think that we would have abandoned ALL standards in publishing this one.