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Dear Michael and Angus,

Subject – Revisions to Handbook chapter, “Publishing and Information”

I write with regard to the requested revisions to my submitted chapter for your forthcoming Oxford Handbook of Publishing.

As I understood the requested revisions, for ease of reference, they were:

1. To mention the Google Books scanning programme and the potential for information overload.
2. To address the argument that the Wakefield crisis would have been worse without peer review.
3. To have more on fixity in publishing and underlying epistemology of truth/fixity.
4. To have a firmer set of conclusions.

I have addressed these matters in the following ways:

1. I have added a sentence and reference on page six that covers Google's book scanning programme and a footnote to an excellent recent history of that enterprise.
2. I have added the counter-argument and defended my original assertion here. I think this achieves the balance that was desired.
3. I have added a paragraph on page twelve that addresses the challenges of version proliferation and truth-correlation through the history of textual scholarship. This is the lengthiest of my revisions and I hope it goes some way towards the epistemological claims that you raised.
4. I have added an additional few sentences to the end of the conclusion. It is difficult, here, to re-state this any further without becoming repetitious, but I hope that the new remarks give some more bounding to the work.
Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Martin Paul Eve
Professor of Literature, Technology and Publishing