ney's claim that Neel maliciously experimented with measles vaccine on the Yanomamo, and I listed the evidence, quoting Neel Jr., against those charges. In an article about those accusations, it would have been difficult to do otherwise. Second, I called attention to two sources, including a *Brown Gold* article, indicating that measles was present in the area before Neel's expedition. To my knowledge neither previously had been cited in print. Third, at the time, there were two main candidate vaccines, Edmonston B and the newer Schwarz vaccine, which was known to have fewer side effects, to be simpler to administer, and to be favored in two of three previous studies of vaccine responses in Native Americans. In the article, I quoted the conclusion from Francis Black that using Edmonston B—despite these apparent drawbacks—"was a rational thing to do." Fourth, I wrote, "Vaccine experts argue that the vaccine could not have touched off the epidemic. Measles vaccine co-developer Samuel L. Katz of Duke University says...live-virus measles vaccines are extremely unlikely to be transmissable...both Edmonston B and Schwarz vaccines, Katz says, 'have simply never been seen to be transmissible from a vaccine recipient to a susceptible contact.'" Fifth, according to Tierney, the administrator for Neel's papers, and the officials in charge of Freedom of Information Act requests at the CDC, as well as *New Yorker* fact-checkers, there is no known record of an official protocol for Neel's experiment. Sixth, I described how "Neel and his team tried to vaccinate ahead of the disease." Because they sought to move ahead of the disease and had limited personnel, in many cases they were not able to stay around after vaccination and provide care. I quoted Katz's summary: "[M]any more would have died if Neel had not been there" to vaccinate. Seventh, I did not state that Neel failed to follow contemporary standards. Instead, I made the different point that past standards are now regarded as insufficient. Eighth, I did not write that Neel's studies failed to provide data on Yanomamo health. Indeed, I cited his data on the Yanomamo's vulnerability to measles.

In response to Kim Hill, I quoted his description of Tierney's book as having "massive mistakes" and wrote that Hill "strongly disputes most" of its charges. So far as I can tell, I described all of Hill's main arguments against the book, although I did not specifically cite him every time. Instead, I quoted denials from John Tooby, Kent Flannery, L. Luca Cavalli-Sforza, Michael Price, Bruce Alberts, and Napoleon Chagnon himself, as well as devoted considerable space to other anti-Tierney evidence and arguments.

Finally, Katz writes that he meant by his quoted remark that the vaccine itself saved lives, not that Neel saved the Yanomamo from the vaccine. That is what I meant in quoting him, but if I inadvertently confused any readers on this point, this chance to clarify matters is welcome.

CHARLES C. MANN

CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

REPORTS: "The sequence of the human genome" by J. C. Venter *et al.* (16 Feb., p. 1304). In Table 10, the last column under the heading "Gene prediction" should have read "Total (Otto + de novo/2×)." In the References and Notes section, the authors for reference 176 should have read "A. Krogh *et al.*"; the journal name in reference 177 should have been "*Proc. Intell. Syst. Mol. Biol.*"; and in note 181, the acknowledgement list should have included after G. Edwards the names L. Foster, D. Bhandari, P. Davies, T. Safford, and J. Schira.