

**And because mistakes and fakes shall abound,  
the way of truth will be evil spoken of**

Dmitri Martila

*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Tartu University,*

*4 Tahe Street, 51010 Tartu, Estonia\**

(Dated: July 4, 2020)

**Abstract**

This section can be deleted on your demand; but to pass the peer-review with an intellectual joy, it is added to the paper. It is not demand for a change to methods and procedures, but my opinion and vision of a better world, i.e. better for me personally, the community good enough to accept my papers.

---

\*Electronic address: [eestidima@gmail.com](mailto:eestidima@gmail.com)

The goal “to find mistakes” could be a bad attitude. The final goal should be to enjoy reading the publication. If flaws are seen, they must be reported. However, this report should be given without any laughs and sadistic enjoyment. Instead, the flaws should be reported with some sadness.

The psychologists have conducted a social experiment: they told the probants that the man on the photo is a serial killer. The probants testified that he is looking like one. The next day they told another group of probants that the man on the same photo is an American national hero; these probants have confirmed his heroic look.

In conclusion, having the “mistakes desire” as your default position while reading the manuscript of an unknown author increases the chances for the paper to be unjustly rejected. The scientific skepticism should be the readiness to deal with mistakes, but not the expectation – by desire – to find them.

Why do I ask as an author for detailed reports from the referee system? The referee must convince me that I have done mistakes. Otherwise, I would not accept them. Yes, it seems like living in an “utopian” perfect world. But I cannot repent a hypothetical mistake. I can only repent if the mistake is demonstrated to me and I am convinced that it is not the usual fake-news, trolling or bullying. This research principle is my personal “guiding star” during my quest for the objective truth. As an example, the absolute majority of scientists have accepted the proof for Goldbach’s weak conjecture, but not all of the scientists have accepted it yet, mainly because it is not published in a journal. Therefore, one needs to have personal convictions and opinions to move forward. [1]

To navigate in Science, you need to have a personal point of view and convictions you should not rush to abandon. Otherwise, you will soon be disoriented. Only then you will realize the objective truth. That is the subjective search for the objective truth because you are choosing what is right and what is not.

---

[1] Massimiliano Proietti *et. al.*, Experimental test of local observer-independence, *Science Advances* 5(9), eaaw9832 (2019), arXiv:1902.05080 [quant-ph]; Ian T. Durham, Observer-independence in the presence of a horizon, arXiv:1902.09028 [quant-ph]