rhesus (*M. mulatta*) in the laboratory. Other laboratory lore and a half dozen recent field studies of various primate species (*2*) suggest that each of them possesses fixed traits of temperament, especially of irritability and aggression. Bernstein and Guilloud's recent letter (*3*), however, indicates that not all stumptails are as gentle as those encountered by Kling and Orbach, and they warn that some may be troublesome in the laboratory. Apart from the use of these characteristics as criteria for the choice of animals, these apparently species-fixed variations of simian temperament should be studied in their own right. While this has been done to some extent, little use has been made of the powerful method of cross-fostering, which would help to determine whether (to oversimplify) the surliness of the rhesus and the tolerant friendliness of the stumptail (or free-living gorilla) are genetically built-in or are determined by the experience of being reared by a surly or a friendly monkey mother, in a particular animal "culture." Kuo (*4*), who has, in effect, made the lion and the lamb to lie down together, is one of a number of investigators who have modified presumed species-specific traits by manipulating early experience. Others (*5*) have ingeniously extended the use of cross-fostering to cross-species fostering—abolishing the combativeness of mice by rearing them with rats. It would be most desirable, in the interests of clarifying our understanding of the effects of early experience and of providing some crucial controls in the field of behavior genetics, to go up the phyletic scale to the stumptail, the rhesus, the pigtail, and other monkeys.

Such studies would be feasible only in major primate research facilities; private correspondence has revealed difficulties in allocating such facilities for the purpose; hence this appeal to investigators who can do so to establish breeding colonies of several different species under conditions permitting cross-fostering along with other manipulations of genetic strains and of aspects of early experience (size of "family," competition among adults, parents' mothering experience, artificial mothering, presence of monkey sibs, and so on) which Harlow and others have taught us to look for.

L. JOSEPH STONE
Department of Child Study,
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie,
New York

References

1. A. Kling and J. Orbach, *Science* **139**, 45 (1963).
2. For example, G. B. Schaller, *The Mountain Gorilla: Ecology and Behavior* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1963).
3. I. S. Bernstein and N. B. Guilloud, *Science* **147**, 824 (1965).
4. Z. Y. Kuo, *J. Genet. Psychol.* **97**, 211 (1960).
5. V. H. Denenberg, G. A. Hudgens, M. X. Zarrow, *Science* **143**, 380 (1964).

Referees: Credits and Demerits

Page (Letters, 12 Mar., p. 1241) is right! Referees should be compensated. The compensation should be in the form of public acknowledgment, in a footnote to each published paper, of the referee who assisted in preparing the paper for publication. This system works well in the reviewing of book manuscripts. It would have many advantages for the publication of scientific papers also.

SAMUEL RAYMOND
Papper Laboratory of Clinical Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4

It is most unfortunate that the reviewers who are selected by editors of many scientific journals—*Science* being an exception, in my experience—make no distinction between dissemination of current scientific information and the publication of items of historical scientific interest. Current material becomes historical as manuscripts accumulate dust on the reviewers' desks.

I propose to editors the following equation for evaluating referees:

$$T_t = 14d + 1.4d\,(P_t - 5),$$

where T_t is the total time (in days) that an editor should tolerate stalling, d is a period of 24 hours, and P_t is the total number of typed, double-spaced pages (excluding references). (For referees who are not adept at algebra, the evaluation of T_t for a 20-page manuscript is 5 weeks; for 5 pages or less, 2 weeks.)

Scientists should retaliate against editors and their lethargic reviewers. When submitting manuscripts they should require that the editor adhere to this formula or return the manuscript immediately. Otherwise, ethical practice should permit the scientist to submit his manuscript to several journals simultaneously and then withdraw it from editorial consideration by others after one journal has accepted it.

DUNCAN MCCONNELL
Ohio State University,
Columbus 43210