

Letters

NSF and Citation Analysis

Nicholas Wade's article "Citation analysis: A new tool for science administrators" (News and Comment, 2 May, p. 429) by and large presents a fair assessment of a new and *potentially* useful tool for science administrators and perhaps for scientists themselves. However, Wade makes one statement concerning the National Science Foundation (NSF) that needs correction—namely, that the NSF "is using the technique to assess its funding of chemistry departments and as a safety net to catch chemists who write bad grant proposals but are heavily cited."

The NSF chemistry section does not use citations in its review process or in assessing its funding. Aside from any consideration of citations, the chemistry section does not fund chemistry departments. We support individuals, not departments, on the basis of proposals written by them and submitted by their institutions on their behalf. The extent of support received by a given department is not a criterion for deciding upon the possible support of any individual in that department.

We do not provide a safety net to catch chemists who write "bad" proposals. The implication of the statement seems to be that the staff of the chemistry section gives a bonus to heavily cited chemists to prevent a "bad" proposal of theirs from being declined. This is not the case. If a heavily cited chemist writes a "bad" proposal, as judged by his peers, then he or she will meet the same consequences as anyone else who does a poor job. We do not use citation analysis as a backup to our present peer review system.

The chemistry section is studying the possible utility of citations in several respects, such as postgrant evaluation, and observation of interactions between sub-disciplines and changes in these interactions. We plan to continue these studies.

Quite apart from the concern of whether citations measure anything substantive, however, there is a basic question concerning the accuracy of raw citation data sorted only on the basis of the names of investigators and not carefully analyzed to remove homographs (same name, different

person). This problem is severe even when the individual sorting is detailed to a last name and two initials, and we urge the producers and users of citation data to give serious thought to its solution.

O. W. ADAMS

Chemistry Section, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550

Academy Forum Publication

I read Albert Jonsen's letter (11 Apr., p. 98) concerning the National Academy of Sciences' forum on human experimentation with great interest. Since both the forum, and Jonsen's letter to a lesser degree, are likely to stimulate discussion and debate, I would like to inform readers that the published presentations and discussions from this forum are now available in paperbound edition. *Experiments and Research with Humans: Values in Conflict* may be obtained for \$5 per copy from the Printing and Publishing Office, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20418. Prepayment must accompany all orders.

LAURIE STROBLAS

Printing and Publishing Office, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. 20418

Is "Doomsday" on Target?

Fifteen years have now passed since von Foerster, Mora, and Amiot published their thesis "Doomsday: Friday, 13 November, A.D. 2026" (1). Their work contained the following formula for world population, N , as a function of time, t

$$N = \frac{1.79 \times 10^{11}}{(2026.87 - t)^{99}} \quad (1)$$

where time is measured in years A.D., the derivation having been based on a combination of empirical and theoretical reasoning. As they showed, the formula provided a remarkably close representation of human population for the period 1750 to

1960, for which figures of some accuracy are available, and also was in agreement with estimates of population 1000 and 2000 years ago.

On this 15th anniversary of their article, and as our bicentennial year approaches, it seems appropriate to ask whether the world's population still remains on target according to Eq. 1.

Putting $t = 1975$ in Eq. 1, we find that $N = 3.65$ billion persons. On the other hand, the Population Reference Bureau's 1975 estimate for N in mid-1975 is 3.97 billion (2). Thus, we are not merely on target according to Eq. 1, we are in fact comfortably ahead of schedule. That is, while the formula of von Foerster *et al.* predicted an infinite world population as of A.D. 2026, our present growth rate gives us hope of reaching the desired goal even earlier than they expected.

Some of my colleagues have suggested that, in view of this, we should revise our estimate of the glorious moment, moving it forward say 5 years, thus giving a larger number of those presently alive some hope that they might be present to celebrate the event.

That Eq. 1 underestimates world population for 1975 is, however, probably an anomaly due to our relative freedom over the past 15 years from major wars, pestilence, or famine. Indeed, the Population Reference Bureau (2) sees a "medium variant" population of 6.25 billion persons in the year 2000, which would indicate a turnaround because Eq. 1 predicts 6.87 billion persons for that year. Whether the turnaround will be as great as anticipated by the Population Reference Bureau can, however, be debated. It seems unlikely that the world will so quickly give up its opportunity to reach the desired goal by 2026, before the oil runs out. (The writer may also perhaps be forgiven a personal motive for not wishing to change the year 2026. He will be exactly 100 years old on 1 November of that year, and cannot resist the thought of the usual press interview: he is storing up useful and wise sayings for the event.)

An incisive reader might see difficulties—either human or theoretical—with Eq. 1, but these difficulties have already been carefully dealt with by von Foerster *et al.*, not only in their original article, but also in response to a series of later comments on it (3). We content ourselves with the remark that other predictions of the 1975 world population, made at essentially the same time as von Foerster *et al.*'s, ranged from 3 billion to 3.5 billion and thus were considerably less accurate. We are similarly confident that, in 15 years (A.D. 1990), the world population will be much closer to the value predicted by