
James P. Lodge, Jr.: a tribute to an editor

I would like to share here a reminiscence of Jim Lodge. Jim took the responsibility of being editor very seriously. To a great extent *Atmospheric Environment* reflected his taste and judgment, and it is fair to say that in his capacity as editor Jim truly helped to shape our field. He always worried about rejecting a paper that might have valuable data, even if the interpretation was questionable or over the implications that rejecting a paper might have on a scientist in a less developed

country or on the career development of a younger scientist. At the same time, he recognized that referees often put a lot of work into reviewing a paper (much more than is often the case these days) and that it was difficult to keep them on board if he went against their recommendations. It was a thin line, he felt, he had to walk on.

I myself, at an early stage in my career as an atmospheric chemist, was one of the people who

benefited from Jim's care and concern. Back in the early 1980s, John Freiberg and I had written a paper identifying the several mass-transport processes involved in the dissolution and aqueous-phase reaction of gases in cloud droplets, developing expressions to determine the conditions under which mass transport limits the overall rate, and quantifying the decrease in uptake due to mass-transport limitation. We felt that this work was an important contribution, but to our dismay the reviews came back mixed. While one of the referees was enthusiastic, the other had written that the paper was "very long and doesn't really seem to say anything which isn't already well known to workers in the field," a review which was hardly encouraging to us as authors and which clearly gave Jim some concern. In his letter to us he wrote "here I am faced with a rather difficult situation. The favorable reviewer is of my own selection. The one who says it is "uninteresting" is a reviewer selected by a fellow editor, D.J. Moore. In each case, of course, it is necessary to keep our reviewers happy so that there is some hope that they will serve again."

Fortunately Jim decided to keep the favorable reviewer happy at the risk of losing the other referee. As it turned out, the paper became a bit of a hit, widely cited, with its findings later reproduced in textbooks. Years later, when I encountered Jim at a meeting, I took the opportunity to call this to his attention. I vividly recall his pleasure at this outcome. I am thus pleased to have the opportunity not only to acknowledge Jim's critical support to my own career as a young scientist but more broadly to highlight the key role that he played in the furtherance of our discipline.

Stephen E. Schwartz
Department of Applied Science
Brookhaven National Laboratory
Upton, NY 11973-5000, USA

November 2002

doi:10.1016/S1352-2310(02)01006-3
