Dear Professor Rakover:

I attach two reviewers' assessments of "Two Factor Theory of Understanding ...," which you submitted to JMB, plus my usual notated copy of the manuscript. You will quickly see that while the reviewers agreed with the basics of your initial proposition, they both offered much food for thought in terms of a revision, should you decide to go forward. From my perspective, their most challenging suggestions pertain to (1) the claim that some scientific procedures and understanding and the "set up" for the presentation of these procedures themselves use non-scientific knowledge etc., and (2) the removal of material pertaining  to the understanding/knowledge/religion of religion, as these may require a separate paper and some of your statements would open up "cans of worms," as the expression goes.

On my own reading I found the topic of interest to JMB -- firm interest -- but the paper a tad unwieldy in terms of organization and form and presentation. Most of my notes in the attached ms are straightforward and easy to decipher their meaning. I shall list below (not in order of importance) some other suggestions.

A beginning suggestion is not to use acronyms or initialisms. Across psychology, some acronyms are not ambiguous (for example, MMPI, ANOVA). But other abbreviations are not so fortunate, and even a three letter acronym can generate hundreds of meanings.Thus, this state of affairs leads to different meanings ascribed to acronyms and initialisms. For instance, SD can refer to the Semantic Differential scale, standard deviation, social desirability, sleep deprivation etc. Hermann Ebbinghaus in 1885 showed that ambiguous stimuli are poorly discriminated. There is absolutely no reason to overload your text with ambiguous codes that are geared to render the text easier to grasp but instead make facile understanding more difficult. Readers should not have to work so hard to decipher a sentence’s meaning by decoding abbreviations. At least this is what I found. Write out initials fully if coming at the very beginning of a sentence. Of course, you may use initialisms in your formulas -- although both readers had questions about the these.

The paper"reads" (seems) a tad long. Perhaps removing material pertaining to religions may assist that. Some of the material is also best presented as a footnote -- I have indicated these. The first sentence of the abstract seems redundant ... perhaps? Please also use JMB's standard three section headings: centered bold; left justified, all major first letters capped, one line above paragraph text; and indented, italics with only first letter capped and running into text on the same line after a period. Indent all paragraphs. Do not use more than one colon in a sentence;  paragraphs must be more than one sentence long. Please refer to your other JMB articles for style and form, thank you.

Page 12, line 4: at this point, are you here suggesting that more than one posited cause is a violation of explanation?

Throughout paper: can you explain in more depth what is an explanation from will/belief please?  Page 20, line 11 from bottom: you write that a question will be immediately raised, but I do not see a question here. Line 4 from bottom, same page: "to this..." is rather non-specific. Page 21, line 14: can you provide the reader with a phrase to serve as a very brief introduction as to the dilemma that is coming up? A brief transitional phrase would assist us. Page 23, bottom lines: this claim that the moment Mary experienced redness, she grasped it, seems a bit understated.

Page 25: please check the German translations. You seem to have translated the verbs rather than the substantives.

Concerning the reference list, remember to insert chapter page number spreads for edited works. Add  "Retrieved from" before electronic reference addresses.

The reviewers have offered you many suggestions. We shall be interested in your analysis and evaluation of these suggestions, as well as your intention to revise or not.

Sincerely,

Raymond Russ, Editor

Journal of Mind and Behavior