Thank you for the clarification around the literature John. I’d of course defer to your judgement on selected papers for review but would suggest John Butenhoff and myself for 3M reviewers (or to delegate internally).

Also, which journal(s) are you editing?
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No problem. I will stop tracking down and reading literature and also stop doing reviews of PFC papers. Most of the "literature" work was spend on doing reviews of PFC manuscripts that were sent to me for review. Because of my duties as the editor for two journals I would normally turn down these opportunities to review papers, but have been taking on the reviews, which generally take about 4 to 6 hours, depending on the paper. I have two that just came in yesterday. Would you like to have me refer them to someone in house at 3M. My personal advise is that you want to keep "bad" papers out of the literature, otherwise in litigation situations they can be a large obstacle to refute. We are dealing with a number of these sorts of papers in the atrazine issue. Judges seem to be of the opinion that if information is in the peer-reviewed, open literature, it is accurate.

I assume that you are keeping track of the literature in case we need it in the future.

Sincerely,

John P. Giesy
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