John Gardinier's Commentary on "The Very Interested Reviewer"

Commentary On
The Very Interested Reviewer

1. I would not indicate in my review that I had a shorter and better proof.
2. Assuming the result being reviewed is original and as good as or better than anything *published* in my field to this point, I would recommend the article for publication. I would also point out to the editor that I would like to cite this article in my own writing, so please let me know the publication date/data as soon as possible.
3. I would write up my own article, citing the article I had reviewed with its full publication reference. I would mention that my own work on this article was stimulated in part by that article. I would avoid making any invidious comparisons; let the relative worth of the two methods be judged by the readers.