

# COMMENTS



I would like to call to the attention of authors for *Fusion Technology (FT)* the possibility of submitting their manuscripts on disk. Detailed guidelines are presented on p. 1580 of this issue. As indicated there, the American Nuclear Society can accept 3½- or 5¼-in. floppy disks in a form that can be stored to ASCII. The disk is to be submitted after reviewer comments have been received and corrections are complete. I wish to encourage authors to consider this possibility because it will help reduce typographical errors and also keep journal expenses to a minimum.

The present issue includes the paper "On the Economic Prospects of Nuclear Fusion with Tokamaks" along with a letter to the editor about this article and a second letter in response by the authors. Clearly, the attractiveness of fusion for commercial power rests on its competitiveness in terms of economics, safety, and environmental compatibility. The Senior Committee on Environmental, Safety, and Economics Aspects of Magnetic Fusion Energy (ESECOM) report (*FT*, 13, 7, 1988) adopted the attitude that if fusion economics were at least in the "ballpark" with other advanced energy sources, fusion's future would largely be determined by safety and environmental considerations. Economics, however, remains a very debatable issue (here I use the term "economics" to imply both dollar value and energy payback). The paper on economics in this issue is clearly quite controversial. Indeed, earlier versions of it generated strong debate in Europe. The present manuscript went through our standard review procedure. During the process, one reviewer said, "*FT* should not shy away from controversy as long as articles follow sound technical principles in good faith."

The Letters to the Editor department in the journal provides a good forum for discussion of such controversial issues within the fusion community. Consequently, I am pleased that we have two letters in this issue and welcome additional letters on this or other topics in the future. Indeed, in the first editorial I wrote in this journal, I included an encouragement for such letters, and there have been some letters since then. Examples of recent letters include those in the November 1988 and January 1989 issues in connection with the paper "Subcooled Water Flow Boiling Experiments Under Uniform Heat Flux Conditions." However, there have not been nearly as many letters as I had originally anticipated. In fact, I have had several conversations with persons who stated that they strongly disagreed with a certain article in *FT*. Then they said that they were surprised when no one wrote a letter to the editor about the article. My immediate response was, "Why didn't you write such a letter?" I hope more readers will consider this open invitation in the future.

*George Miley*