

Special Publication

Simeoni, R.J. (2011). Why athletes do not negative split some endurance events: A thermodynamics-based explanation. *5th International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedical Engineering (of the ieee)*. Wuhan, China. ISBN 978-1-4244-5089-3

Given the innovative and boundary-pushing nature of many of Dr Simeoni's published new ideas, it is not uncommon for his works to generate scientific debate and divide opinion. Such scenarios should be considered healthy in science. After all, even Einstein is known for advocating: the power of imagination within his major discoveries; the notion that a majority opinion of so-called "experts" should not go unquestioned or considered sacrosanct; and the notion of putting forward and publishing copious ideas (including lesser-known ideas compare to his famous theories) for the sake of healthy scientific dialogue.

It turns out that the simplest of all Dr Simeoni's publications is presently the most controversial. The relatively short four-page conference paper (essentially an abstract) was presented in 2011 at the ieee's *5th International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedical Engineering*. Wuhan, China (see full details above).

Anyone interested in acquiring a personal copy of this paper is welcome to email Dr Simeoni since the on-line ieee Xplore index has a puzzling web posting declaring its removal due to an unspecified violation (note that the paper has not and cannot be removed from the conference hard proceedings).

Dr Simeoni's perspective of, and rebuke to, the above is as follows:

1) The ieee posting declares an opportunity for appeal but several emailed requests (since September 2020) for information on the appeal process have gone unanswered.

2) The ieee decision supposedly was made by a panel of experts but no report has been made available. In science, any time a paper is reviewed by peers a report for the Author is and should be standard – otherwise, how can one construct a fair case for appeal in this particular instance. Hence, it is my position that no fair appeal process is available, despite the ieee's posting suggesting otherwise.

*3) Several emailed requests asking when the decision was made (to try and make sense of the mystery) have gone unanswered. The only received reply which I have found meaningful states that the paper was removed due to **falling outside the scope of the ieee** (see copy of email correspondence on final page), and my expanded perspective on this point is as follows:*

- The paper/abstract is only 6 pages (within conference guidelines) and is the most minor of all of my publications. This minority status is in line with a philosophy (appropriately shared by many other academics) that conferences are firstly a means of raising new ideas which benefit from conference deliberation and subsequently become more substantial works. This is the case for the paper/abstract in question which became a stepping stone for a full journal publication a few years later.*

- *The minor status of the **completely original** paper/abstract was such that I would not have been surprised if it was not accepted for the ICBBE 2011 conference, which would have been fine. However, the paper/abstract was reviewed by ieee-appointed expert referees pre conference, accepted, and published within a hard CD publication ISBN 978-1-4244-5089-3. My belief is that it is not appropriate to accept the paper/abstract and substantial conference registration fee, and then after the fact reject and post on-line vague descriptors such as “violation” - if there is any so-called violation it falls on the ieee, since all aspects of the paper/abstract, including referencing, were completely original, open and transparent.*

4) Because the paper/abstract is part of a hard CD conference publication with an official ISBN number, it is the same as being published within a book. My strong belief is that no person or institute has the right to dictate to another that a publication cannot be cited (see ieee on-line notification). Even if my paper/abstract is removed from the ieee Xplore index, my paper/abstract exists, and always will, and any individual has the right to cite from the published conference proceedings, positively or negatively, if they freely choose to do so.

5) Perhaps the ieee’s motivation is, as they state, simply that my paper/abstract falls outside of their scope (see email below). Regardless of this possible change-of-mind basis, I clearly see the ieee’s conduct/procedures as being surprisingly unprofessional. I, and anyone reading the ieee’s on-line notification, is forced to speculate and so following is my extended perspective on another possible/speculated motivation:

- *My paper/abstract is written from the perspective of a physicist and I know from experience that some exercise scientists, athletes or coaches some times do not like a physicist “infringing upon their domain” and simplifying or thinking differently about one of their major research areas. The title of the paper/abstract alone (addressing why athletes do or do not negatively split some endurance events) is certainly likely to divide opinion, be controversial, and have opponents within the noted spectrum of professionals. I know this from experience having previously worked in a Health Faculty (School of Exercise Science). It is important to note though, that I have also found some past colleagues supportive and open to such new ideas, so this negative aspect of the perspective is naturally not a sweeping generalization.*
- *The above scenario has been found within the nature of sport for decades – many examples of different schools-of-thought on ways to legally optimize performance, whereby athletes and coaches are either in one camp or another, exist and can be cited. From my perspective as a past athlete (modest level of surf lifesaving competition), the position of the paper/abstract makes practical sense, but I know that other athletes and coaches in different camps/schools-of-thought will not agree with the paper’s position. Again, that has always been the nature of sport/science and is fine and healthy. It would be a sad state of scientific affairs if the ieee’s decision was motivated by negative comments on the paper/abstract from some camps (for which conflicts of interest could even exist).*

*Dr Ricardo Simeoni
03/03/2021*

A copy of a relevant email correspondence from the ieee is as follows:

The screenshot shows a webmail interface for Ricardo Simeoni. The browser address bar shows the URL: email.telstra.com/webmail/index-rui.jsp?v=1479958955288#app/mail. The interface includes navigation tabs for 'Small Business', 'Business & Enterprise', 'Health', and 'Sport & Entertainment'. Below these are links for 'Shop', 'Support', 'My Account', and 'Search Telstra.com'. A 'Welcome ricardo.simeoni' message is displayed with links for 'Help', 'Settings', and 'Logout'. The email header shows it is from 'IEEE Support Center <SupportCenter@help.ieee.org>' dated '12/09/2020 10:'. The subject is 'Appeal Process etc [Reference #: 200905-000215]'. The email body contains the following text:

Subject: Appeal Process etc

Reference #: 200905-000215

Response By Email ([REDACTED]) (09/11/2020 08:31 PM)

Dear Dr Ricardo Simeoni,

My apologies for the misunderstanding of your request.

The reason your paper was retracted was due to it being out of IEEE scope.

Please let me know if there is any else I may assist you with today.

Warmest Regards,

[REDACTED]

Conference Quality Specialist

IEEE Meetings, Conferences & Events (MCE) | 445 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, NJ 08854 USA
t: +1 855 340 4333 (Toll Free US & Canada) | +1 732 562 3878 (Worldwide) | IEEE-MCE@ieee.org

IEEE - Advancing Technology for Humanity

Customer By CSS Email (ricardo.simeoni@bigpond.com) (09/11/2020 06:46 PM)

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your reply. However please note that whilst I wish to expedite the appeal process, at th requested information about the issue/basis of withdrawal. I cannot formulate a case for defense unt information - any fair and reasonable appeal would require that I have an opportunity to construct ar that addresses the specific issue.