Comment

Comment on the paper "Theory and applications of a surface inspection technique using double-pass retroreflection"

Lionel R. Baker
21 Long Acre
Orpington, Kent
BR6 7RD, United Kingdom

I am moved to comment in support of your invitation to authors, published as an editorial in the September 1993 issue, to submit their proceedings papers suitably extended to *Optical Engineering*. Perhaps if this policy had been observed in the middle of the last decade, your author Reynolds et al.,[1] appearing in the same issue, would have seen the paper by Biddles and Baker[2] describing the use of retroreflective material for inspecting transmitting and reflecting surfaces, published apparently some eight years before their discovery.

References

1. R. L. Reynolds, F. Karpala, D. A. Clarke, and O. L. Hageniers, "Theory and applications of a surface inspection technique using double-pass retroreflection," *Opt. Eng.* **32**(9), 2122–2129 (1993).
2. B. J. Biddles and L. R. Baker, "Surface inspection of optical and semiconductor materials," *Proc. SPIE* **60**, 34–38 (1975).

Response

Response to "Comment on the paper 'Theory and applications of a surface inspection technique using double-pass retroreflection' "

Rodger L. Reynolds
Diffracto Limited
2835 Kew Drive
Windsor, Ontario
N8T 3BT, Canada

While we agree wholeheartedly with making selected material from proceedings more accessible, we are not convinced that it has any bearing on our paper. The authors are aware of Biddles and Baker's device (as well as similar retroreflective-based inventions), having discoverd them during our patent search. It is clear to us that our use of nonscanned full-field illumination with a noncoincident light source makes the hardware configuration unique and significantly different from those devices, postulated by others, that have made use of retroreflection.