# LETTERS



#### **Curious minds**

If experts can't decide on the merits of a medical procedure, how is an ordinary citizen to do so? How many transistors can dance on the head of a chip? Is too much sun bad for coffee? Can great poetry be "cloned"? (Left, Dolly, the muse.) Do mutant *Drosophila* fruit flies provide a good "model" of the sexual behavior of *Homo sapiens* males? And didn't two Italians discover "swollen atoms"?

#### Forty-Something Breast Screening

I write to comment on a statement in the sidebar "How one radiologist turns up the heat" (News & Comment, 21 Feb., p. 1057) of the article "The breast-screening brawl" by Gary Taubes, in which I am quoted as attributing Daniel Kopans's harsh criticisms of my epidemiologist colleagues at the University of California, San Francisco, to "frustration on [Kopans's] part." I trust that readers understand that no one but Kopans himself would have reasonable insight into what motivates his actions.

In addition, the entire sidebar portrays Kopans as a lone extremist who is anathema to me and to the many others who agree with his endorsement of mammography screening for women in their forties. Quite the contrary, despite his occasional excesses, Kopans has won the support of screening proponents for his tireless advocacy of the benefits of screening and for his numerous, scientifically valid peer-reviewed articles on the subject. It is unfortunate that Kopans is singled out, when the statements of any of several strident screening opponents could also have been criticized.

The recent National Cancer Institute Consensus Conference failed because the only consensus it produced asked each individual forty-something woman to decide for herself whether she should undergo mammography screening. How is a woman (or her primary health care provider, for that matter) to decide on the merits of screening when the "expert" panel could not decide? We need clear, concise statements that promote action rather than indecision.

> Edward A. Sickles Department of Radiology, University of California, San Francisco, CA 94143–1667, USA

#### Predictive Value of Drosophila

The Drosophila fruitless (fru) mutant analysis of Lisa Ryner et al. (1) discussed by Wade Roush (Research News, 13 Dec., p. 1836) is an important contribution to our understanding of the largely unknown genetic basis for insect behavior. But the evolutionary implications put forth by Ryner et al. detract from the value of the work. The discussion of vertebrate, and especially human male, sexual behavior in light of Drosophila behavior is problematic. Ryner et al. recognize that sex determination is different in Drosophila and in mammals. But they also suggest that Drosophila sex determination has predictive value for mammals: They seem to imply that the demonstration of Drosophila genetic control of courtship behavior would support a homologous genetic component in mammalian courtship and mating. This suggestion rests on one of two assumptions: Either courtship behavior can occur in only one way regardless of what the organisms are, or the most recent common hypothetical ancestor of Drosophila and Mammalia had courtship and the same mechanism of determining courtship. There is insufficient evidence to support the former, and the last common ancestor of Drosophila and Mammalia was likely a marine invertebrate with external fertilization without courtship behavior (2). This hypothetical ancestor would also have to be shown to have demonstrated sexual preference and mate choice.

Ryner *et al.* (1) show that male mutant fru flies are unable to differentiate between male and female flies, unlike wild-type males. This observation does not support their interpretation (1, p. 1086) that

sexual orientation in flies is controlled by the same hierarchy of genes that controls all other aspects of sex.

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<sup>™</sup> bottletop filter device and a receiver flask. Its superior performance is the result of our fast flow, low protein binding Millipore Express<sup>™</sup> 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. 1 on Readers' Service Card

http://www.millipore.com/sterile

http://www.sciencemag.org • SCIENCE • VOL. 275 • 14 MARCH 1997