## CONFIDENTIAL COMMITTEE MATERIALS

## **SIGBOVIK 2007 Paper Review**

Paper 34: A New Historical Analysis of /n/

Reviewer Two, ACH Committee on Retrocausal Publication Impact

**Rating: Reject** 

**Confidence: Expert** 

This paper presents a so-called "new" analysis of  $/\Lambda$ . Unfortunately, the claimed contribution is not actually a contribution, as the equivalent subject matter of "um" was already thoroughly studied by (Parenti 2016). In the extremely unlikely event that I am mistaken, the authors should clearly elaborate what distinguishes their paper from the existing future work. The submission would be improved by rewriting it with a retrocausal reference frame, especially to include the citation recommended above.