release in March 1987.

Tseng left for the University of Miami in the summer of 1986. Soon after, the medical board at Mass Eye and Ear decided it should look into Tseng's study, partly because of some irregularities in the clinical trial and partly because of "undercurrents of conflict of interest," says Dohlman.

What followed was a 9-month investigation by Mass Eye and Ear, followed by 7 months of scrutiny by the faculty conduct committee at Harvard. Details of the case, however, only appeared in public after the *Globe* got hold of the story in October.

In a November letter to the entire faculty of the Harvard Medical School, Dean Daniel Tosteson wrote: "There remains serious concerns about how the institutional policies and procedures could have been bypassed to allow this flawed clinical study and conflict of interest to proceed without existing safeguards falling into place."

When asked why safeguards did not fall into place, Tosteson says that part of the problem is the faculty's dim awareness of guidelines concerning conflicts of interest. And part "is taking them seriously."

"Harvard's conflict of interest policy was like the Magna Carta. . . . It was off in a glass box somewhere," says Kenyon.

Tseng's attorney points out that there was no conflict of interest policy in place at Mass Eye and Ear when Tseng arrived in Boston in the summer of 1984. But Harvard Medical School, where Tseng had an appointment, did have such a policy in place. Still, Dohlman admits that not many people at Mass Eye and Ear knew of its existence.

The whole affair is causing some institutions to reevaluate their policies regarding conflict of interest. Ephraim Friedman, president of Mass Eye and Ear, has recently formed a panel to consider beefing up the hosptial's policies. The University of Miami is planning its own introspection. Says Robert Rubin, vice provost for research in Miami: "I don't think we have a policy that we could point to and everybody could understand."

■ WILLIAM BOOTH

# NIH Panel Finds No Fraud in *Cell* Paper but Cites Errors

Last June, three distinguished immunologists spent 2½ days in Boston investigating the accuracy of a paper Nobel laureate David Baltimore and colleagues had published in 1986 in *Cell*. Informal reports at the time suggested that the panel concluded that the paper contains errors but vindicated the authors of suggestions of fraud (*Science*, 15 July, p. 286).

Now, in a draft report the panel, which conducted its investigation for the National Institutes of Health, officially dismisses implications that flaws in the paper derived from fraudulent behavior. "In view of the fact that the panel found no evidence of fraud, misconduct, manipulation of data, or serious conceptual errors, the panel felt that no further action was required . . . ," according to the draft, which *Science* has obtained.

But further action there will be. For one, Representative John Dingell (D–MI), the powerful congressman who held hearings on the *Cell* paper last summer (*Science*, 1 July, p. 18) is likely to hold more hearings sometime in February. In addition, Baltimore and his coauthors do not accept all of the NIH panel's findings about inaccuracies in the paper and have written two rebuttals that run to some 30 pages. Thus, it is possible that the panel's report will be modified (or accompanied by a dissenting report) before it is officially released.

In the rebuttal, Baltimore and coauthors declare "Where the panel is critical, it has based its criticism mainly on the form of our presentation of the data. It is where the panel members would substitute their own judgment for our own that we take exception."

For example, the authors recently published a letter in *Cell* (*Science*, 2 December, p. 1240) in which they acknowledge various errors and misstatements in the original 1986 article. The NIH panel thinks they should have gone further, particularly with regard to errors in one of the paper's important tables—table 2. The panel said inaccuracies in table 2 are "sufficiently serious" to merit correction and that different data should have been presented. In their rebuttal, the authors say simply: "We disagree. It was our belief that table 2 was the best way to summarize a large amount of data in easily accessible form."

This is but one of the topics of continuing dispute. At present, the draft report and the *Cell* authors' replies are in the hands of the NIH committee which is comprised of Joseph M. Davie of Searle Pharmaceuticals, Hugh McDevitt of Stanford, and Ursula Storb of the University of Chicago. NIH officials still hope that the matter can be resolved before the end of the year. But, in any case, it looks as if the resolution may not be as clear cut as many people have hoped it would.

■ BARBARA J. CULLITON

# "Fifth Force" Update: More Tests Needed

Physicists reviewing data from gravitational measurements taken in a hole in the Greenland ice sheet say more experiments will be needed to determine if Newtonian gravity needs modification. The comments came at last week's meeting of the American Geophysical Union in San Francisco.

Mark Ander of Los Alamos National Laboratory, team leader for the Greenland experiment, said analysis of the data shows "a strong non-Newtonian signal" that could be evidence for a deviation from Newtonian gravity. However, the data conceivably could be explained by unusual density distributions in the rock beneath the Greenland ice sheet, and members of the team differ on whether it is more reasonable to postulate such unusual distributions or to suggest that Newtonian gravity needs some fine tuning.

"Many of us [team members] feel it's stretching geology tremendously to get that distribution," Ander said, and they lean toward the likelihood of a new component of gravity, sometimes referred to as a "fifth force." Robert Parker of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, who did new calculations to show what type of density distribution would be needed to explain the Greenland data, was the most cautious of the group. "I think the Greenland experiment is not a good candidate for evidence against Newton's Law," he said.

Richard Hughes, a theoretical physicist working with the group, said little has changed since the group announced results last summer. Analysis done since then has shown that the density distributions necessary to explain the data would be unusual but not impossible. "In my opinion, it is probably a new piece of gravity," but "all of us would say a better experiment needs to be done." A new experiment in the middle of the ocean is already under way.

Ander and Hughes were irritated by press reports they had backtracked on their earlier position. At the meeting, Hughes emphasized that deviations from Newtonian gravity are likely to be evidence of an additional component of gravity and not of a so-called "fifth force." Jokingly, he told his audience, "Read my lips: No new forces."

After an Associated Press story used that quote to indicate Hughes was recanting earlier statements on the need for a new component of gravity, he said he knew "how politicians must feel when they're quoted out of context."

"I'll never tell a joke in front of reporters again."

■ ROBERT POOL