Allocating Federal Funds for Science and Technology (1995), but little has been done to implement the recommendations.

Service's article, nevertheless, does prompt one to raise the questions of what criteria are appropriate for certain sciencerelated funding decisions and with whom does the funding decision-making responsibility reside. Setting science priorities, even within a given field, is not the same as establishing funding levels, that is, scientific input may be necessary, but not sufficient. It is inappropriate to ask a committee to provide recommendations if they do not have or are not given the full understanding of such a complex task. That is why certain decisions have to be left to the governmental or political process, in the best sense of the phrase. Scientists should be involved, but they have no more or less ability to predict the future and make wise funding decisions than do economists, lawyers, or politicians. If scientists are asked to make recommendations that are not appropriate, it will only lead to frustration and further cynicism regarding the entire funding allocation process.

> Louis Ianniello 20006 Holly Pond Way, Gaithersburg, MD 20879, USA

Particulate Matter Policy

Consistent with Jocelyn Kaiser's News & Comment article "Showdown over clean air science" (25 July, p. 466), airborne particulate matter (PM) has been repeatedly associated with morbidity and mortality, even at concentrations well within the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) 150microgram per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$) upper acceptability limit on 24-hour average PM of 10 micrometers or less (PM-10). Failure to identify plausible mechanisms by which PM-10 (or PM-2.5, or both) might cause such effects at these low concentrations suggests to some that stressors associated with PM, rather than PM itself, might be causal.

Attributing PM effects to 24-hour averages reported under the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) is like attributing daily mortality reported in a war zone to 24-hour airborne lead concentrations instead of bullets. Real-time PM monitoring has revealed significant variability during 24-hour periods of low PM (1). Brief PM excursions have reached twice the estimated concentration prevailing during the 1952 London fog. Effects that EPA attributes to 24-hour average PM seem equally consistent with causation by excursions to high PM concentrations, whose health significance is becoming increasingly evident. Excursions also could explain why a 24-hour PM effect threshold has been undiscernible, even though noncancerous effects typically exhibit thresholds. Effect thresholds can exist for PM too, but if they are threshold excursions embedded in 24hour averages, their contribution to the 24-hour averages might be imperceptibly small, suggesting absence of a threshold.

This approach represents a more economical challenge for industry, whose compliance with the NAAQS could then focus on a small fraction of daily operations when PM control is least effective.

> **Robert A. Michaels** RAM TRAC Corporation, 3100 Rosendale Road, Schenectady, NY 12309, USA

References

1. R. A. Michaels. Aerosol Sci. Technol. 25, 437 (1996).

Corrections and Clarifications

In the letter "Genetics of Parkinson's disease" (14 Nov., p. 1213) and in the Table of Contents for the same issue (p. 1198), co-authors of Timothy Lynch—Matt Farrer, Mike Hut-

