

April 7, 2013

Dear Ms. Jennifer Wright Sharp,

My comments on the proofs for my book review are below.

Let me start with three "editorial" decisions that my editor had made and that I disagree with. Let me also say right at the start that the final decision is in the hands of the editor, and he/she may feel free to disregard my comments. Though I would much prefer that the editor will accept my comments, and perhaps even adopt them for use in other book reviews. I sincerely believe that my review was better (even if just slightly) before those editorial changes were made.

1. I much dislike numerical citations, such as the "[8,12,15]" on the first page of my review, as opposed to what it had been before, "[Jo, Wi, RT]". Yes, we could write all of mathematics using a single name for all variables, separating them only by a numerical index: "Let a_1 be a continuous function from a space a_2 to a space a_3 , and let a_4 be a compact subset of a_2 . Then $a_1(a_4)$ is a compact subset of a_3 .". We never do that, and the reasons are obvious. Likewise for citations. The informed reader may immediately recognize that "[RT]" means Reshetikhin-Turaev (just as the informed reader may recognize that "f" means a function), and even the less-informed reader will gain by more readily recognizing that all occurrences of "[Va]" in the review refer to the same author.
2. I quite liked my idea of introducing a special citation, "[Book]", which refers to the book under review. This allowed me a shortcut reference to the book and to specific parts of the book using the same style as for other references, while keeping this particular reference distinguished (as it should be). The editorial transformation, "[Book]" to "[3]", is a painful loss of information. I've defined "[Book]" in two places: at the very top of the review and within the references section and I cannot imagine any confusion could arise.
3. A lesser point – I try to "inline" small figures and wrap the text around them; I believe it is more readable, plus it saves space.

Now the actual "proofs": (Here again, if any editorial changes were intentional, I accept the editor's opinion).

1. Figure 1 would be much better in colour, though I appreciate that this is probably impossible. Yet it should be enlarged to the full width of the text in the page! As it is now, parts of it are too small to be readable.
2. Page 1, right above the figure: "Then in the 1980s" should start a new paragraph.
3. Page 1 line -3: "aroused" should be "arose" (my mistake).
4. Page 1, last footnote: the segment "copyleft at [url]" may be removed as you have added a Creative Commons copyright note.
5. At the end of the same footnote, please add "I wish to thank N. Bar-Natan, I. Halacheva, and P. Lee for comments and suggestions."
6. The crossing symbols in footnote 3 on page 2 are barely visible and perhaps should be enlarged (though this might just be a photocopying artifact).
7. Page 3 line 5: "Blind to 3D topology" should start a new paragraph.

8. In figure 3, the sentence “A Jacobi diagram in a circle” refers to the big circular diagram at the left of the figure, and perhaps should be brought closer to that circle.
9. Page 4 line -7: “finite-dimension representation” should be “finite-dimensional representation” (my mistake).
10. In the last formula of Theorem 5 and in the sentence right following it, “R” should be “ ρ ” (my mistake).

Thanks for catching several other mistakes that I made!

Sincerely,

Dror Bar-Natan

Dror Bar-Natan.