which I had referred was that setting forth the replamine process, published in the 1970s. My criticism of a failure to cite this literature was not aimed at Bianconi's *Nature* article (*1*) (where decisions of whether to cite articles should fairly be decided by authors and reviewers) but at the *Research/Penn State* article (*2*), which includes a lengthy text on the biological connections of Bianconi's work, without reference to the biomimetic work at Pennsylvania State University reported in more than 50 papers and eight patents leading to prosthetic devices as well as electroceramic composites, which have gone all the way to the marketplace.

My focus was on the use of "biomimetic" or other biorelated terms by her and others in conjunction with the research in question. I never stated or meant to imply or infer that she was careless or engaged in lazy practices or cheating of any kind. Similarly, I have never meant to imply, nor do I believe now, that she engaged in any form of scientific misconduct. Finally, I regret that the private memo I circulated to funding agencies and others contained the imprecise statements I have referenced above and that some of these statements were published in the open literature.

Unfortunately this whole affair has taken on an untoward tone. There have been errors, omissions, and exaggerations—perhaps on both sides. It is time to close this chapter for the good of Pennsylvania State University.

***Rustum Roy***
*Materials Research Laboratory,*
*Pennsylvania State University,*
*University Park, PA 16802*

## REFERENCES

1. P. Bianconi, *Nature* **349**, 315 (1991).
2. N. Brown, *Res. Penn State* **12**, 21 (March 1991).

■

## Top Quark Search: More Clarification

I would like to clarify several points raised in Faye Flam's article "Researchers quell quark rumor: The top is still at large" (News & Comment, 24 July, p. 475) and in the letter by my colleague Krzysztof Sliwa (2 Oct., p. 13).

Early in the article the incorrect impression is given that Richard Dalitz and I were handed unpublished data from the Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF) collaboration surreptitiously by Sliwa and that we two theorists went off and analyzed that data ourselves. On the contrary, the work on modifying the method of Dalitz and Goldstein (*1*) and applying that method to data was a three-way collaborative effort.

Through studies of some real data, and many studies of simulated data, we conceived a method for discriminating real top quark

production from background (*2*). Subsequently, we applied the method to data that had been processed and corrected. The results of that work were presented in two CDF internal reports that we three coauthored. Although we individually contributed our expertise to the analysis, this analysis was a synergistic and collaborative process, by no means the exclusive effort of any one of us.

As far as the question of access to data is concerned, we were quite open with CDF. It was known from our first presentation that our work involved some of their corrected data. However, there was never any intention to publish that data without CDF approval. For several months there were no objections to our collaboration; indeed, some CDF members encouraged us to continue. By late April however the mood at CDF changed markedly, as the article notes, and CDF decided not to include us nonmembers in their collaboration.

***Gary R. Goldstein***
*Department of Physics and Astronomy,*
*Tufts University,*
*Medford, MA 02155*

## REFERENCES

1. G. Goldstein and R. Dalitz, *Phys. Rev. D* 45, 1531 (1992).
2. G. Goldstein, K. Sliwa, R. Dalitz, in preparation.

■

## Old Words from the Wise

In 1971, in an obscure journal (*Science*, 14 May 1971, p. 674), I published a book review with the sentence: "Physics-envy is the curse of biology." I made up that sentence myself. Imagine my surprise when I read in the same journal in 1992 (Random Samples, 1 May, p. 611) that "physics envy" is attributed to chemist Paul Bickart of the Environmental Protection Agency in a recent book by Jack Hitt, *In a Word*. I challenge Bickart and Hitt to establish that Bickart, or anyone else, originated the phrase before me. Am I doomed to be another victim of Stigler's Law? (Stigler's Law asserts that a discovery is named after the last person to discover it, because once a discovery has been named, no one else claims it as a discovery. Stigler's Law was discovered many times before Stigler named it.)

***Joel E. Cohen***
*Laboratory of Populations,*
*Rockefeller University,*
*New York, NY 10021–6399*