

Circle No. 1 on Readers' Service Card

Air Pollution and Mortality

In our letter (9 Aug. 1991, p. 606) about the article by Alan J. Krupnick and Paul R. Portney (26 Apr. 1991, p. 522), we pointed out uncertainties in the assignment of effects of mortality due to air pollution on the basis of comparisons among U.S. metropolitan areas (an "ecological" study) by Haluk Özkaynak and George D. Thurston (1). Krupnick and Portney agreed with our assessment, but Thurston and Özkaynak (Letters, 24 Jan., p. 382) defend their point estimates. Our basic argument is that uncertainties about magnitude and causal agent are inherent in all ecological studies of this kind. In particular, one of the key findings of Lipfert et al. (2) was that a slightly superior t statistic provided no guarantee that one model (or pollutant) gave a statistically significantly better fit than its competitors. Furthermore, the significance of a variable is not a measure of its relative toxicity. As one attempts to assign costs of pollution damage to particular pollutants, it is important to recognize the poor state of our ability to fix blame. A "winner take all" approach to estimating benefits is inappropriate, given the wide disparities in control costs for equally plausible "responsible" pollutants

and the small differences in their performance in alternative regression models. Frederick W. Lipfert Samuel C. Morris Brookhaven National Laboratory, Associated Universities, Inc., Upton, NY 11973

REFERENCES

- 1. H. Özkaynak and G. D. Thurston, *Risk Anal.* 7, 449 (1987).
- F. W. Lipfert *et al.*, "A statistical study of the macroepidemiology of air pollution and total mortality" (Report 52122, Brookhaven National Laboratory for the U.S. Department of Energy, Upton, NY, 1988).

Corrections and Clarifications

- In Mark R. Patterson's report "A mass transfer explanation of metabolic scaling relations in some aquatic invertebrates and algae" (13 Mar., p. 1421), the formula for the Reynolds number two lines above equation 1 should have read, "Re = $\rho UW/\mu$." In table 2 (p. 1422), the mass exponents for the flat plate of laminar and turbulent flow should have been 0.75 and 0.90, respectively. In the abstract, the range of exponents given in line 6 should have been 0.31 to 1.00.
- In the ScienceScope article "Emergency rescue for Soviet germ plasm" (3 Apr., p. 19), samples of germ plasm were incorrectly identified as "ascensions." They are "accessions."

SCIENCE • VOL. 256 • 8 MAY 1992

The ideal way to measure osmolality.

The biotechnology explosion has expanded the need for measuring the osmolality of solutions. Such measurements are critical in many areas of research. The most current and accurate means of measuring osmolality is the Wescor Vapor Pressure Osmometer. More than 5,500 laboratories now use the Wescor VPO routinely.



Here's why it's so popular:

- Accepts any biological sample, including viscous liquids, tissue specimens and cell suspensions with no need to alter the physical state of the specimen.
- Accepts sample volumes as small as 2 microliters.
- Avoids measurement artifacts that often accompany freezing point measurements.
- Electronic accuracy and reliability without mechanical complexity.
- If you are working with living cells or have other applications for accurate concentration measurements, investigate the Wescor VPO. It's the ideal osmometer.

Contact Wescor, Inc. 459 South Main Street, Logan, UT 84321 USA. (801) 752-6011 or (800) 453-2725. FAX (801) 752-4127.



Circle No. 33 on Readers' Service Card