are moved forward as powerful whips hitting the body of the attacker. This action confuses the predator and gives time for the peacock mite to escape. Furthermore, the leaflike setae (photos 1, 2, and 4), located around and over the body and legs, work in two ways: first, as plate protection, the strong reinforced spines (photo 4) on each seta are naturally projected, and any predator that bites it will have a nasty surprise; and second, as an anchor and tactile attachment system (photo 2), the dorsolateral (DLS) setae will sit against the open wounds or striations on the host. This helps the mites in their feeding and walking process by keeping the mites closer to their plant host. The palmate setae and their defense and feeding behavior made *Tuckerella* mites the Stegosaurus of the mite world.

Ronald Ochoa
Systematic Entomology Laboratory, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Station, BARC-West, 10300 Baltimore Avenue, Beltsville, MD 20705, USA. E-mail: rochoa@sel.barc.usda.gov

References

1. E. W. Baker and A. E. Pritchard, *Ann. Ent. Soc. Am.* **46**, 243 (1953); B. McDaniel *et al.*, *Acarologia* **17**, 274 (1975); R. Ochoa *et al.*, *Phytophagous Mites of Central America* (El Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñaza, Turrialba, Costa Rica, Serie Tecnica no. 6, 1994), p. 234; D. Walter and H. Proctor, *Mites* (Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux International, Sydney, Australia, 1999).
2. R. Ochoa, *Int. J. Acarol.* **15**, 205 (1989).
3. Mite material for photos was provided by C. Childers, University of Florida, Lake Alfred.

Funding for the Unexpected

A comment of mine criticizing one aspect of the peer-review system at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is quoted in the News Focus article "NIH eyes sweeping reform of peer review" by Bruce Agnew (5 Nov., p. 1074). But this comment was only one of several more constructive comments I sent to NIH, such as possible solutions to some of the problems with funding decisions, which I present here.

Many of our major advances in science were based on an element of chance, such as the discovery of penicillin. From a statistical perspective, then, the greater the number of scientists working on diverse projects, the greater the chance of the important, unexpected discovery.

To provide funding to more scientists and thus increase the chance that a grant will lead to the unexpected discovery, I proposed several solutions. (i) Put a cap on funding to individual groups or laboratories. Although there are many talented scientists funded by NIH, none deserves tens of millions of dollars in funding (from government sources) while so many highly qualified researchers and junior scientists go without any. (ii) With the savings from (i), research funding could be more equitably distributed. This change might bring two benefits. First, it might increase the likelihood of the unexpected discovery and leave some room for serendipity from the unheralded investigator at a small state university. Second, the peer-review situation might be improved. Funding decisions would be more clear-cut and there would be less acrimony and tension because more investigators would be sharing a piece of the research pie. (iii) Grants could be funded on a sliding scale in relation to their score. Although receiving only 50% of the requested budget for a funded grant would be a disappointment, the reduced funding would still allow the project to proceed. Scientists might learn to become more frugal with the taxpayers' money. Partial funding would certainly be preferable to receiving no funding whatsoever for the project.

Donald S. Dwyer
School of Medicine in Shreveport, Lousiana State University, Shreveport, LA 71130–3932, USA

CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

In the Perspective "On the edge of the solar system" by Rodney Gomes (*Science*'s Compass, 19 Nov., p. 1487), the words "symbol 176" inadvertently appeared in two temperature values in the third paragraph. The temperatures should have read 40° and 9.5°.

In the report "Differentiation stage–specific inhibition of the Raf-MEK-ERK pathway by Akt" by Christian Rommel *et al.* (26 Nov., p. 1738), the labels and brackets on figures 3 (top) and 5 (bottom) were not reproduced properly. The figures are reproduced below.