

Discussion

Fri Jul 20 10:34 **N. J. A. Sloane**: Dear ALD: Obviously you are a new contributor, and do not understand the editing process. I find your excessive complaints unjustified, and rather annoying. You should be grateful to the editors for their work. You should not complain about the two-week delay. The OEIS is the equivalent of a top mathematical journal, and two weeks is nothing for a submission that required a lot of work. However, the sequence is of interest. I have made further edits and I will approve it.

<http://oeis.org/history?seq=A316460>

Neil Sloane <njasloane@gmail.com>

To

Andrei-Lucian Dragoi

Jul 21 at 9:46 PM

Dear Andrei-Lucian Dragoi,

I have been compelled to block you from the OEIS for 12 months. Reason: You would not accept the decisions of the editors.

I realize you were new to the OEIS, but in a short time you managed to disagree with and upset several of the editors-in-chief. This was unacceptable behavior.

Neil J. A. Sloane, President, OEIS Foundation.

11 South Adelaide Avenue, Highland Park, NJ 08904, USA.

Also Visiting Scientist, Math. Dept., Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ.

Phone: 732 828 6098; home page: <http://NeilSloane.com>

Email: njasloane@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Sloane,

1a. Mr. Felix Fröhlich "confessed" that he had never published an article of mathematics in a peer review journal before.

He actually presents himself on OEIS such as: "I am just a guy who is interested in in numbers, especially prime numbers.

However my level of understanding of number theory is nowhere near that of a mathematicians, so please have a bit of patience with me. Thanks."

https://oeis.org/wiki/User:Felix_Fröhlich

Actually, I had plenty of patience with Mr. Felix Fröhlich.

1b. You claim that OEIS is the "equivalent of a top journal" but you work with volunteer "reviewers"/"editors" that never published in a peer review article? How is this possible?

We surely don't have the same definition for "a top journal" in mathematics.

OEIS is far from a top mathematical journal, from my point of view.

If you would have looked for "quality" (and not quantity: measured as number of approved submission per unit of time),

you would have worked with a small number of good (paid or professional volunteer) reviewers.

2. Mr. Joerg Arndt (https://oeis.org/wiki/User:Joerg_Arndt) indirectly offended me with formula "terminally confused", regarding my personal choice to create a page on Vixrapedia on my meta-conjecture "VBGC".

Cite from Mr. Arndt: "Fri Jun 29, 09:14: Joerg Arndt: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/> is a bunch of junk journals, vixrapedia.org is home of the terminally confused. This will be rejected."

<https://oeis.org/history?seq=A316297&start=40>

3a. I have expressed my disagreement with other editors/reviewers but with arguments and without any personal attacks (as I have received from Mr. Arndt and didn't even receive a minimal apologize, as Mr. Arndt broke the "ethical code" of OEIS promoted at this link: https://oeis.org/wiki/Good_Behavior_Guide_For_Contributors_and_Editors)

3b. Whom I have exactly offended? If you don't give exact names and the reasons of "upset" it is illegitimate to accuse me.

3c. Maybe I have generated envy on OEIS(?): it is much more plausible!

As long as I am very sincere and direct (and promote truth with arguments), truth must not be a reason of "upset" on me.

3d. I have also observed the superficial arguments of some reviewers/editors and "unmasked" them.

3e. I have even remarked (in a past email conversation thread of ours) that you don't even consider the definition of a sequence

as an important criteria for its "interestingness", which is a narrow and rigid approach.

3f. Rhetorical question. Why should I be "sorry" to have discovered such a large quantity of superficiality and narrowness on OEIS?

This large quantity is in high contrast with your claims for OEIS to be "the equivalent of a top journal".

4. Blocking me for 12 month is essentially a loss for OEIS, not for me, as I had in mind to submit many other interesting sequences to OEIS in the near future. Keep in mind that I am an OEIS contributor with an article published in a peer review journal (a journal for which I also work as a volunteer reviewer).

5. I shall also make public this last conversation between us:

all researches must also know the weak points of OEIS and should not blindly trust OIES and its reviewers, many without any published articles in mathematics (I am sure of the term "many" as both an absolute number and a percent: it is an information based on my intuition, as OEIS hasn't made public and statistics on its volunteer reviewers and editors)

6. In my opinion, for the future, you must establish a mandatory criteria for volunteer reviewers to have at least one published article in a peer review journal BEFORE "playing" as reviewers/editors on OEIS.

7. Did you judge transparently? I don't think so, as I haven't found on OEIS any list of criteria and situations that put a contributor at risk to be blocked for various specific reasons, for well established periods of time.

In conclusion, I totally disagree with your decision and blame this decision for being unfair (excessively radical) and untransparent.

When a reviewer offends me (like Mr. Arndt did!), he gets no blocking, but if others complain on me, I get blocked with no specific arguments other than some vague general complaints.

Normally, I should have firstly received a notification with some arguments against me and some requests to me: and then, if I wouldn't respect those requests, then I would have maybe deserved to be blocked.

8. I am not "new" to OEIS: I have also submitted a sequence in 2017.

Your protocol of reviewing isn't however transparent to the reader regarding the specific step-by-step sequence of reviewing a submission:

this reviewing protocol should be also posted on OEIS so that all contributors to see the exact step-by-step algorithm of reviewing on OEIS.

9. The fact that I come from Romania (which is regarded by the Western world as a "second hand" country) doesn't mean that I am a fool, or a superficial, or a narrow mind. I love truth and fairness and cannot shut up when I see any facts/issues of superficiality, narrowness, bad faith or transparency.

"Excuse" me for being such a direct and honest person:

I have received this education from my parents and my teachers (including my math teachers!).

10. VBGC public reference:

<https://www.vixrapedia.org/wiki/VBGC>

Best regards!

dr. Andrei-Lucian Dragoi

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andrei_Lucian_Dragoi2

<https://univermed-cdgm.academia.edu/AndreiLucianDragoi>
