

# LETTERS

## Labor intensive

A proposal is made to require "the contributions of all authors to be baldly and briefly stated" in scientific papers. Readers discuss the degree of danger posed by excess weapons plutonium and methods for the "combination of expert opinion" to estimate risk. A graduate student union is said to "have fought for, and won," benefits for teaching assistants. Researchers say that "one should be conservative" when considering growth hormones as possible therapeutic drugs. And the contributions of a physicist and former president of the Estonian Academy of Sciences are said to have been "remarkable."

TERRY E. SMITH

## Multiple Authorship

The recent case of fraud in the laboratory of Francis Collins has elicited proposals for ensuring that authors share responsibility for the data they report in scientific papers (Letters, 6 Dec., p. 1593). These proposals have focused principally on imposing conditions for authorship. An alternative means of allocating responsibility for the contents of a paper would simply require the contributions of all authors to be baldly and briefly stated. Such a statement could conveniently be placed in the acknowledgements or in a footnote of a paper giving each author's initials and contribution—for example, "A.B., immunohistochemistry, wrote paper; M.B., polymerase chain reaction and Northern blots; E.L., physiological recordings; M.E., donated antibodies; B.S., intellectual contributions, co-authored paper, provided funding and lab space."

Such a practice would also serve the scientific community by publicly allocating credit for published work. The information would be widely useful in judging work submitted for doctoral theses, making hiring and tenure decisions, and evaluating grant applications. To encourage the fair allocation of credit, other useful practices could also be adopted. For example, in cases where two

authors have contributed equally to a paper but cannot both be listed as primary authors, their names might be separated not with a comma but with a subscripted equal sign. This convention would allow the relative contributions of authors to be evaluated at a glance.

**Benjamin White**

Yale University School of Medicine,  
Department of Pharmacology,  
New Haven, CT 06520, USA  
E-mail: bhwhite@biomed.med.yale.edu

May I bring to the attention of *Science's* readers what the American Association of University Professors Committee B on Professional Ethics had to say concerning the responsibility of co-authors? In a 1990 "Statement on multiple authorship" (1), the committee observed:

that scholars who take part in a collaborative project should explain forthrightly—to disciplinary peers as well as to academic colleagues and such members of the public as may have occasion to inquire—the respective contributions of those who put their name to the finished work. This clarification might be accomplished in a preface, an extensive footnote, or an appendix: no one format can serve every scholarly combination. But a candid statement would do much to establish degrees of responsibility and authority, to ensure fair credit to junior or student colleagues, and to avoid unseemly later disputes about priority, real or alleged errors, and plagiarism. Purely formal association with the enterprise (such as the headship of a laboratory where no direct research involvement was present) would be noted for what it is, to the benefit of the participants as much as of those outside the field.

Making plain the actual contribution of each scholar to a collaborative work may not be easily achieved in every academic field, but it is a goal worth striving for.

**Jonathan Knight**

Associate Secretary,  
American Association of University Professors,  
1012 14th Street, NW,  
Washington, DC 20005-3465, USA

## References

1. *Academe* 76, 41 (September–October 1990).

## "Clear and Present Danger"?

Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky's thoughtful letter "Disposing of excess plutonium" (3 Jan., p. 11) properly emphasizes the need for

FILTER  
IN HALF THE TIME

## Go with the Flow!

Tired of waiting for your old vacuum cup to process your media, buffer, or biological solutions? Or losing valuable protein during filtration? Then, get speed without getting stuck with our **Stericup™ vacuum filtration and storage unit.**



The Stericup system consists of our redesigned Steritop™ bottle-top filter device and a receiver flask. Its superior performance is the result of our fast flow, low protein binding Millipore Express™ membrane and a larger membrane surface area for dramatically faster filtration without sacrificing recovery. The unit also features:

- New no tip/easy grip flask design
- Recessed bottom allows stacking for convenient storage
- Tab inside the funnel holds prefilter securely in place

**Call for more information.**

In the U.S. and Canada,  
call Technical Services:  
1-800-MILLIPORE (645-5476).  
To place an order, call Fisher  
Scientific: 1-800-766-7000  
(in Canada, call 1-800-234-7437).  
In Japan, call: (03) 5442-9716;  
in Asia, call: (852) 2803-9111;  
in Europe, fax: +33-3.88.38.91.95

**Circle No. 2 on Readers' Service Card**

**MILLIPORE**

<http://www.millipore.com/sterile>