

FEB 21 1962

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
MEDICAL CENTER
PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF GENETICS
School of Medicine

February 19, 1962

Dr. Eugene Garfield
Institute for Scientific Information
33 South 17th Street
Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania

Dear Gene:

Let me try now to take care of some of the questions that have been accumulating over the past weeks.

1. Let me reiterate how pleased I have been to see the first print outs on the Citation Index. I would also repeat a.) the titles probably are desirable but b.) auto references and references repeated on one page probably should be suppressed in any printed versions of the output.

2. Lancet would be a valuable journal to include in ^{SCI-}considering Genetics.

3. The sorting by journal would, of course, be important for setting up print out distributions according to the journal, but I seriously doubt whether it is worthwhile printing out very much of this at the present time. Perhaps you had more in mind than I readily perceive.

4. I hope it will be possible as a part of the experiment for you to send me a copy, in some form!, of the complete print out sorted by author. I am collecting a backlog of items that I would like to check on via a citation index but will not bother you with this at the present moment.

5. I should have anticipated what you ran into ⁱⁿ ~~in~~ Ray Lowry and warned you about it. His 1951 paper might very well turn out to be the most frequently quoted one in Biochemistry as it represents a standard method for the determination of protein. As I may already have said it does, of course, still have its uses to include it in the indexing, although an abbreviated system might perhaps try to economize on items of this kind.

6. I would personally be quite happy to use a miniprint format for this kind of index. It is probably considerably more convenient for scanning than full size print. I was delighted at your proposal on a unified index to science that accompanied your letter of January 19, but I would like to think more deeply about some aspects of it. I have not been happy about proposals to use a newspaper format for the publication of abstracts without provision for the critical documentation of authors claims. But I wonder what part of the total national liter-

Do you mean repeats of a reference to the same author?

*1 RV
What will we get out of SACS, etc.*

ature in a field like Health Sciences could be covered, with full publication, in a daily newspaper. Do you have a quick rundown on that kind of estimate? You will have received a copy of the depository proposal that I am pushing in the Science Information Panel. I have been very much worried how this could be brought to its necessary critical mass to prove itself since many authors may be reluctant to be the first ones to use the depository and distribution on call as an alternative to journal publication. The newspaper distribution of these documents would, I believe, rapidly build up interest in the system at which point it should gradually become converted into a vehicle for the publication of titles and indices and news of science rather than the typical articles themselves.

7. Your letter of February 10 refers to a personalized citation index service, an idea that could have lots of ramifications. Each subscriber would probably give you a list of the things that he would want you to look out for on a current basis and I doubt if you would want to prescribe this so rigidly as to specify particular "in-laws" for the selection. If I did specify all of my "cousins" I would probably be swamped by them. turn you gave me (have you developed an explicit terminology to describe the nth order relationships of reference and referants?--see Science 135:351 February 2, 1962.)

8. In re programming for computer linkage routines, I've sent you a reference to Newcombe's paper which is often quoted in this respect. I think that Bourne at SRI is particularly interested in this and he makes a number of reminiscent references in his bibliography. What I know of part itself is not very encouraging as its usefulness seems to depend on the operation of a single parameter (time) to define the success of a complex operation.

9. Some while ago you asked for some additional suggestions for committee members for the Genetics-SCI project. I'm not sure who among my colleagues shares my preoccupation with information problems except as suffering consumers. I would have suggested Ray Owen, but leave it to you whether there might not be some discomfort because of his other role as a member of the Genetic Study Section. The same concern might attach to Jim Crow, who would be a splendid committeeman. The other Cal. Tech. man who comes to mind is Norman Harowitz, also in the Biology Department. At Berkeley I would suggest Roger Stanier who now heads the Bacteriology Department there.

10. Going over our recent correspondence I caught your remark on page 4, November 15, about the importance of timeliness and the difficulty we have in understanding what we really need because our present systems are so clumsy. I couldn't agree with you more!

More follows

Johns.