

Nancy Maynard
Anthony J. McMichael
Jonathan A. Patz
R. Brad Sack
Robert Shope

University of Maryland,
Biotechnology Institute,
College Park, MD 20740, USA

Heisenberg Meets Photobiology?

In their report "Independent photoreceptive circadian clocks throughout *Drosophila*," Nov. 28, p. 1632), Jeffrey D. Plautz *et al.* demonstrate the existence of photoreceptors and independent circadian oscillators throughout the fruit fly. This elegant work is based on recording emission patterns of visible photons.

Heisenberg's uncertainty principle warns physicists that the very process of measuring a process may change its qualities. If the laws of physics apply to photobiology, as they must, and if photoreceptors exist throughout the fruit fly, as the results demonstrate, then it is reasonable to ask if the output of light by the green fluorescent protein (GFP) may have itself distorted the experimental results. Furthermore, if other species are shown to have ubiquitous photoreceptors, as do fruit flies, the increasingly popular use of GFP as a tool may run into Heisenberg's limitations elsewhere in the study of molecular biology.

Dan A. Oren

Department of Psychiatry, and
Department of Molecular Biophysics
and Biochemistry,
Yale University,
West Haven, CT 06516, USA
E-mail: dan.oren@yale.edu

Response: Oren correctly points out that the use of fluorescent probes to study processes in photosensitive cells and tissues has some obvious caveats. However, we only use the brightly fluorescent GFP to localize clock cells expressing the *period* gene, whereas we use the dimly bioluminescent market luciferase to track clock activity in real time.

We have performed many control experiments to demonstrate that luciferase-generated bioluminescence does not interfere with circadian clock activity. Most of these controls are published in previous papers cited in our report. However, it is highly likely that the much higher photon flux generated by the illumination of GFP and its subsequent emission would activate the circadian photoreceptors. Thus, luciferase has the advantage of not only being sufficiently

unstable to report temporal changes, but also does not produce enough light to detectably perturb the system.

We fully expect that advances in fluorescent protein technology will circumvent these problems, both by destabilizing the protein marker and generating probes whose excitation and emission spectra do not overlap those of biological photoreceptors.

Steve A. Kay

Department of Cell Biology,
Scripps Research Institute,
La Jolla, CA 92037, USA
E-mail: stevek@scripps.edu

Corrections and Clarifications

■ The cover legend for the issue of 6 February (p. 775) incorrectly identified the Hall of the University of Pennsylvania (shown at the bottom, left). The key on the same page should have credited the photo (no. 4) to the University of Pennsylvania Archives.

■ In references 1–4 of the letter "The HUGO Mutation Database initiative" by R. G. H. Cotton *et al.* (2 Jan., p. 10), the dashes before "cotton" in the World Wide Web addresses should have been tildes.

■ In the report "The spatial dimension in population functions" by E. Ranta *et al.* (28 Nov., p. 1621), the labeled units of the y axis in figure 1G (p. 1622) should not have begun at the bottom with "–1.0" and "–0.5," but should have read, "0" and "5," respectively.

■ Elizabeth Pennisi's article "The architecture of hearing" (Research News, 14 Nov., p. 1223) did not make clear that Christine Petit of the Pasteur Institute in Paris was one of the researchers who, with Steve Brown and Karen Steel, showed that Usher syndrome 1B is caused by a mutant *myosin VIIA* gene.

■ Reference 26 (p. 1250) of the report "Trace gas emissions and smoke-induced seed germination" by J. E. Keeley and C. J. Fotheringham (23 May, p. 1248) should have read, "M. A. Cohn and L. Castle, *Physiol. Plant.* 60, 552 (1984)."

Letters to the Editor

Letters may be submitted by e-mail (at science_letters@aaas.org), fax (202-789-4669), or regular mail (*Science*, 1200 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005, USA). Letters are not routinely acknowledged. Full addresses, signatures, and daytime phone numbers should be included. Letters should be brief (300 words or less) and may be edited for reasons of clarity or space. They may appear in print and/or on the World Wide Web. Letter writers are not consulted before publication.

Precipitate Nucleic Acids.

IN COLOR!

Pellet Paint™ Co-Precipitant

A highly visible, inert carrier for
routine DNA or RNA precipitation.*

EFFICIENT PRECIPITATION OF DNA AND RNA

- Quantitative recovery of nucleic acids
- Five minute procedure
- No low temperature incubations
- Suitable for precipitation of dilute samples (<2ng/ml)

NO MORE LOST SAMPLES!

- Vivid pink pellets are easily located
- Consistent precipitation ends uncertainty
- Precipitation and resuspension steps are easily confirmed

COMPATIBLE WITH MANY APPLICATIONS

- Pellet Paint contains no DNA, RNA or nucleases
- No inhibition of downstream reactions
- Qualified for:
 - manual and Cy5** sequencing
 - PCR† amplification
 - cDNA synthesis
 - random priming
 - transformation
 - ligation
 - restriction digestion
 - kinase reactions
 - *in vitro* transcription
 - *in vitro* translation
 - gel electrophoresis

*Patent pending

**Cy5 is a trademark of Biological Detection Systems, Inc.

†The PCR process is covered by patents owned by Hoffmann-La Roche.



Novagen

Novagen, Inc.
597 Science Dr. Madison, WI 53711
800-526-7319
Fax: 608-238-1388
e-mail: novatech@novagen.com
URL: http://www.novagen.com

Circle No. 31 on Readers' Service Card