

Eric J. Holowaty  
Division of Epidemiology and Statistics,  
Ontario Cancer Treatment  
and Research Foundation,  
Toronto, ON M5G 2L7 Canada  
Anthony B. Miller  
Department of Preventive Medicine  
and Biostatistics, University of Toronto,  
Toronto, ON M5S 1A8, Canada

## Indirect Costs of Pesticide Use

A discussion of the pros and cons of pesticide use was initiated by Philip H. Abelson in his editorial of 26 February 1992 "Pesticides and food" (p. 1235). The strongest argument against pesticides was raised by David and Marcia Pimentel, who offered impressive figures concerning their impact on human health and environment (Letters, 4 June, p. 1409). Some of these figures were contested by Abelson in his response to the Pimentels (4 June, p. 1410). However, the most important figure, Pimentel *et al.*'s estimate of the total indirect cost of pesticide use as being \$8 billion per year in the United States (1), was not challenged by Abelson.

Because this estimate is the only one available, it will likely continue to be cited in the continuing debate to support the view that pesticide use causes significant harm. However, the figure is highly questionable. The study in which it is presented (1) is based primarily on citations of 20 personal communications, the reliability of which is difficult to assess; arbitrarily chosen values are assumed (for example, the value of a human life is set at \$2 million). The largest component in the \$8-billion sum is the cost

of bird loss (\$2.1 billion). Pimentel *et al.* state that 160 million hectares (ha) per year receive heavy pesticide doses (1), but cite 148 million ha as the total area treated (2). They assume, without statistical support, that 10% of all birds inhabiting this area are killed by pesticides. When one considers that most modern pesticides do not seem to have an adverse effect on bird populations (3, p. 93), the figure seems highly exaggerated. The inclusion of these questionable numbers together with an arbitrarily chosen value of \$30 per bird result in the meaningless figure of \$2 billion.

It seems clear that the \$8-billion estimate put forth by Pimentel *et al.* (1) as indirect pesticide cost should not be used in serious debate regarding future pesticide policy.

Petr Karlovsky  
Institute of Phytomedicine,  
University of Hohenheim 360,  
Otto-Sander-Strasse 5,  
70593 Stuttgart, Germany

## References

1. H. A. Risch *et al.*, *Am. J. Epidemiology* 138, 281 (1993).
2. R. Doll and R. Peto, *Br. Med. J.* 2, 1525 (1976); R. Doll *et al.*, *ibid.* 280, 967 (1980).
3. R. Cederlöf *et al.*, *The Relationship of Smoking and Some Social Covariables to Mortality and Cancer Morbidity* (Department of Environmental Hygiene, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, 1975).
4. W. Haenszel and K. E. Taeuber, *J. Nat. Cancer Inst.* 32, 803 (1964).
5. L. Garfinkel, *ibid.* 66, 1061 (1981).
6. M. T. Halpern *et al.*, *ibid.* 85, 457 (1993); B. W. Gillespie, unpublished material.
7. S. Sidney *et al.*, *Cancer Causes Control* 4, 3 (1993); I. S. Tekawa, unpublished material.
8. S. K. Van Den Eeden and G. D. Friedman, *Epidemiology* 3, 253 (1992).
9. T. Hirayama, *Life-Style and Mortality* (Karger, Basel, Switzerland, 1990).
10. E. W. R. Best, *A Canadian Study of Smoking and Health* (Department of National Health and Welfare, Ottawa, Canada, 1966).
11. R. E. Harris, E. A. Zang, J. I. Anderson, E. L. Wynder, *Int. J. Epidemiology* 22, 592 (1993).

## References

1. D. Pimentel *et al.*, *BioScience* 42, 750 (1992).
2. D. Pimentel *et al.*, *The Pesticide Question* (Chapman & Hall, New York, 1991), p. 224.
3. R. J. Hall, in *Silent Spring Revisited*, G. Marco, R. Hollingworth, W. Durham, Eds. (American Chemical Society, Washington, DC, 1987), pp. 85-111.

## A little of your precious sample goes a long way in our osmometer

Many times when you need to measure osmolality you may have only a limited amount of hard-to-come-by sample available. No problem if you're using the Wescor Vapor Pressure Osmometer. It routinely processes samples of only 10  $\mu$ L and measures them with 1% accuracy. And it can be calibrated for samples as small as 2  $\mu$ L.

Extremely simple to use and highly reliable, the Wescor VPO has another key advantage over the older freezing point osmometers. *It accepts any biological sample including highly viscous solutions and tissue specimens.*

The Wescor VPO has proven to be the ideal instrument for measuring osmolality in all areas of biological research. It's widely used in marine biology, tissue culture, soil and plant physiology, and laboratory animal studies. And you'll find it used for Q.C. work in the food, pharmaceutical, beverage, and ophthalmology industries.

Contact us for more details or to arrange a demonstration. Wescor, Inc. 459 South Main Street, Logan, UT 84321 USA. FAX 801-752-4127. Phone 1-800-453-2725.

