

## Nanosphere™ Size Standards. Certified in billionths of a meter by Duke Scientific

Nanosphere Size Standards are calibrated in nanometers (billionths of a meter) and are available in 22 sizes from 21 to 900 nm. They are available to the National Bureau of Standards. Nanospheres are part of a complete line of spherical particles from 0.02 to 2000 micrometers in diameter. They are used as standards for instrument calibration, quality control, filter checking, and in numerous biotechnology applications. At Duke Scientific—established in 1971—we have the expertise and resources to meet any of your requirements for microspheres and particles. Call us today for information.



2463 Faber Place, P.O. Box 50005, Palo Alto, CA 94303, Toll Free (800) 334-3883, in CA (415) 424-1177, Fax (415) 424-1158

Circle No. 2 on Readers' Service Card



### Corrections and Clarifications


In the letter "Risks from low doses of radiation: Continued" by Marvin Goldman (2 Aug., p. 562), the reference in the last paragraph on page 563 should have been "(3)" not "(2)."

The WWW address for Pedro at the end of note 3 in the letter "Not the 'Dark Ages'" by W. C. Barker and R. S. Ledley (12 July, p. 165) was incorrect. The correct address is [http://www.public.iastate.edu/~pedro/rt\\_1.html](http://www.public.iastate.edu/~pedro/rt_1.html)

The WWW address for the document of the Council of Tobacco Research listed in the response by Jon Cohen (Letters, 12 July, p. 167) was incorrect. The correct address is <http://galen.library.ucsf.edu/tobacco/docs/html/1916.01/1916.01.1.html>

In the references (p. 16) of the letter by Darwin R. Labarthe about "Battling heart disease" (5 July, p. 15), references 3, 4, and 5 should have been listed as one reference, "3," and reference 6 should have been listed as "4." The numbers 1–4 as they appeared in the text were correct.

The figure (p. 47) showing the age distribution of the population of Europe (News, C. Holden, "New populations of old add to poor nations' burdens," 5 July, p. 46) was incorrect. The correct figure is shown below.



box, we will not know whether the cat is dead or alive.

**András Málnási Csizmadia**  
Department of Biochemistry,  
Loránd Eötvös University,  
Budapest, H-1088, Hungary  
E-mail: [malna@ludens.elte.hu](mailto:malna@ludens.elte.hu)

**Achilles J. Sanchez**  
Department of Biology, Brandeis University,  
Waltham, MA 02254-9110, USA

As a naïve molecular biologist, I am perplexed by one facet of the problem of Schrödinger's cat as it is usually presented. Why can't the cat be considered an observer and therefore remove the uncertainty about its own life or death status?

**Randy Morse**  
State University of New York,  
Wadsworth Center,  
Albany, NY 12201-2002, USA

My 12-year-old daughter Phoebe is a student of quantum paradoxes, but she was concerned about an error in the illustration accompanying the Research News article with regard to feline anatomy. Presumably, even Schrödinger's cat would have foreleg "elbows," not "knees."

**Barbara A. B. Seiders**  
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory,  
Richland, WA 99352, USA

The title of the Research News article "Schizophrenic atom doubles as Schrödinger's cat—or kitten" perpetuates a misconception about schizophrenia—which is nothing like split personality—and trivializes a potentially disabling mental disorder.

**Paul C. S. Hoaken**  
Department of Psychiatry,  
Queen's University,  
Kingston, Ontario K7L 5G2, Canada

"Kitten," as used by Taubes, seems needlessly macroscopic as a metaphor for a single trapped atom. How about "Schrödinger's furball"?

**Andrew Ahlgren**  
University of Minnesota,  
Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

### Monkey Business

Presidential hopeful Pat Buchanan's assertion (described in News & Comment, 26 July, p. 421) that he personally is not descended from monkeys explains a lot to those of us who are from this planet.

**Gerald L. Epstein**  
6008 Anniston Road,  
Bethesda, MD 20817, USA