### References

- 1. M. S. Ascher, H. W. Sheppard, W. Winkelstein, E. Vittinghoff, Nature 362, 103 (1993).
- 2. B. J. Ellison, A. B. Downey, P. H. Duesberg, Genetica **95**, 165 (1995). 3. H. W. Sheppard, W. Winkelstein, W. Land, E. Char-
- lebois, N. Engl. J. Med. 328, 1847 (1993).

# **Cell Cycle Arrest**

We were pleased to see the three reports (1-3) and Research News article by Jean Marx (p. 963) in the 17 February issue that highlight the induction of the protein p21(WAF1) cyclin-dependent kinase (Cdk) inhibitor in myogenesis (1) and the high level of expression of p21(WAF1) in terminally differentiated tissues (2). These findings elegantly extend the findings published last fall in our papers "Induction of p21(WAF1/CIP1) during differentiation" (4) and "Induction of differentiation in human promyelocytic HL-60 leukemia cells activates p21, WAF1/CIP1, expression in the absence of p53" (5). We had reported that multiple differentiation inducers caused immediate-early and sustained upregulation of p21 in many cell types through a p53-independent pathway. The report by Skapek et al. (3) demonstrating

p21(WAF1) reversal of a cyclin D1-mediated differentiation block in muscle raises the hope that in some settings p21(WAF1)inducing agents may be anti-oncogenic. We would caution, however, that this strategy would be ineffective in settings in which p21(WAF1) induction is uncoupled from growth arrest. An example is our demonstration that deregulated c-myc expression is capable of uncoupling p21(WAF1) induction both from growth arrest and from differentiation (4).

**Richard Steinman** University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA Barbara Hoffman Dan A. Liebermann Temple University School of Medicine. Philadelphia, PA 19140, USA Paul B. Fisher Comprehensive Cancer Center, Columbia University, New York, NY 10032, USA

#### References

- 1. O. Halevy et al., Science 267, 1018 (1995).
- 2. S. B. Parker et al., ibid., p. 1024.
- S. X. Skapek, J. Rhee, D. B. Spicer, A. B. Lassar, З. ibid., p. 1022.
- 4. R. A. Steinman et al., Oncogene 9, 3389 (1994).
- 5. H. Jiang et al., ibid., p. 3397.

# ...when you make your knockouts with Embryonic Stem (ES) cells and **Mouse Embryo Fibroblasts** (MEF) from Genome Systems, Inc. Making a mouse knockout involves months of hard work. But all that work can be

wasted if you don't start with a strong foundation. You need high quality ES cells that will go germline after blastocyst injection and MEF cells to maintain ES cells in their pluripotent state.

Genome Systems, Inc., has contracted with a major facility to offer you the cells you need to generate knockouts. Our ES cells and MEF cells are fully characterized with a strong proven record of success.



8620 Pennell Drive St. Louis, Missouri 63114, USA

800 - 430 - 0030 or, 314 - 692 - 0033 Facsimile: 314 - 692 - 0044

Circle No. 15 on Readers' Service Card

### "More" Is Not "Different"

I agree with Sheldon Krimsky (Letters, 17 Feb., p. 945) that "[m]odifying an inert chemical structure and modifying an organism are two very different things." Yet, he illogically extends this observation to a comparison of two organisms. Modification of an organism by traditional breeding and by recombinant DNA methods are not very different things. The fact that we can make a greater variety of changes by recombinant DNA is not an inherent reason to place a higher regulatory burden on products of recombinant DNA techniques.

**Ulrich Melcher** Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078-0454, USA

## Sampling Zooplankton: Correction

We have learned that there is an internal inconsistency in the zooplankton dataset used in our report "Climatic warming and the decline of zooplankton in the California Current" (3 Mar., p. 1324) (1). The data



C

file we used, written from the archive maintained by the National Marine Fisheries Service, was found to change at the end of 1977, without notation, from values of zooplankton normalized by sample volume to raw values of zooplankton volume. Because

7.0 6.5 6.0 in Zooplankton 5.5 5.0 4.5 4.0 3.5 3.0 2.5 1950 1960 1970 1980 1990 Year 250 В 200 Zooplankton 150 100 50 1950 1960 1970 1980 1990 Yea

the series was treated uniformly, pre-1978 data were incorrectly normalized a second time, while post-1978 data were handled correctly. This boosted pre-1978 values by up to a factor of 2. Correction of this error does not change the conclusions of our



Fig. 1. Corrected zooplankton time series for Cal-COFI line 90. (A) Time series of log-transformed zooplankton volume (cubic centimeters of zooplankton volume per 1000 cubic meters of seawater strained) averaged over all stations on line 90. (B) Annual averages of line 90 zooplankton volume. (C) Mean of log-transformed zooplankton volume over 7-year periods and standard deviation with respect to those means at each station along line 90, for 1951–1957 and 1987–1993. report. There has been a large decrease in zooplankton biomass during the past 43 years, which is likely related to the concurrent warming of the upper 100 meters. However, the correction does reduce the magnitude of the observed downward trend in zooplankton.

Cruise-by-cruise averages of log-transformed data show the decline of zooplankton volume (Fig. 1A; see figure 2A in our report), which is especially prominent from 1978 to the present. Average values over all cruises in a year were transformed back to natural units by taking the inverse logarithm (Fig. 1B). The average zooplankton volume over the final 7 years of the survey (1987– 1993) was 70% lower than the average over 1951–1957. The reduction was approximately uniform with respect to distance from shore, possibly intensifying slightly offshore (Fig. 1C; see figure 3A in our report).

### Dean Roemmich John McGowan

Marine Life Sciences Research Group, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093–0230, USA

#### References

1. D. Roemmich and J. McGowan, *Science* **267**, 1324 (1995).

# Anything that's frozen is never the same again.



If you need to measure osmolality, basically you have two choices. You can measure osmolality using the older freezing point method, or you can use the modern-day vapor pressure osmometer from Wescor. Now available in a new, easier-to-use menu-driven version, the VAPRO<sup>™</sup> osmometer accepts all biological samples, including the highly viscous and tissue specimens. *All without cryoscopic artifacts!* And it can be calibrated for samples as small as 2µL.

The Wescor vapor pressure osmometer is ideally suited for all areas of biological research. It's widely used in marine biology, tissue culture, soil and plant physiology, and lab animal studies. You'll also find it performing 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. Phone 1-800-453-2725. FAX 801-752-4127.

Circle No. 28 on Readers' Service Card