

## ***Interactive comment on “Overshoot dependence on the cross-shock potential” by Michael Gedalin et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 22 November 2019

Sorry, I cannot do anymore but alerting the EiC which I did.

I must admit that

1. the behaviour of reviewers who extend the response time till its very end or longer is scientifically not acceptable. It violates any serious scientific behaviour.
2. in addition I consider the entire discussion phase a nuisance. It artificially delays publication and is of no other value than letting the journal feel itself important. It contributes zero to science and thus is of no scientific value.

A simple check confirms that hardly any paper submitted to *Angeo* has been "discussed" in public, whatsoever this may mean. The only conversation is with the reviewers. For this no discussion phase is needed.

C1

Moreover, the discussion phase pre-informs the interested public about ideas. This may become sensible as sometimes someone may be fast and publish quickly in another journal without discussion phase.

One should not believe that scientist are generous or honest people, by far not when it comes to the question of priority or ranking. Scientists are egocentric as almost everybody else, sometimes even more.

It is only the scientific method of correctness in experiment and logic which forces them to be scientifically honest, not in any other human sense.

Taking this into account the discussion phase is even counterproductive. There are sufficiently many cases in science where reviewers took their chance to benefit from reviewing a paper containing brandnew ideas, or picking up an idea otherwise in conversation or discussion. Such ideas are then said as having been in the air and have been developed independently at about the same time by different people or groups. It is symptomatic that in conferences and meetings people only very rarely present ideas which have not yet been submitted or are in print or even published.

---

Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2019-111>, 2019.

C2