Concerns over the privately owned *Bambiraptor* fossil are raised, and it is acknowledged that "professional paleontologists and commercial collectors remain strange bedfellows." In the aftermath of a postdoc's failed attempt to sue her mentor, it is observed that "Clear rules need to be followed nationwide for conferring co-inventor status to appropriate students and postocs involved." The issue of whether a circadian period "observed under specific experimental conditions may best be referred to as the 'spontaneous' frequency of the pacemaker" or whether there is an intrinsic circadian period is discussed.

A Home for *Bambiraptor*

There were several omissions in Constance Holden's News of the Week article about the "*Bambiraptor*" conference in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, on dinosaur bird evolution ("Florida meeting shows perils, promise of dealing for dinos," 14 Apr., p. 238). The specimen of *Bambiraptor feinbergi*, a bird-like dinosaur collected in Montana, does not yet have a permanent home in a public museum, contrary to what is implied in the article. That is certainly the hope of the directorate of the Graves Museum in Dania Beach, Florida, which hosted the event, as well as of the professional paleontologists who attended the conference. Graves Museum officials arranged the private purchase of the specimen with the laudable stipulation that it would be donated to a public museum.

Paleontologists await *Bambiraptor*'s public appearance.

CREDIT: GRAVES MUSEUM

However, because the specimen is still privately owned, its publication (*1*) is problematic for many paleontologists. The Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, for example, has an ethics statement opposed to the commercial sale of important vertebrate fossils and will not publish in its journal any specimens not in the public trust. The ambiguous status of *Bambiraptor* caused a number of professional paleontologists to decline to attend the meeting.

The specimen in question was excavated and sold by then-amateur collectors. Some parts of the skull and other bones of the skeleton were severely damaged (*1*). Consequently, it is difficult to tell by comparisons whether this is a juvenile specimen of a new taxon or of a taxon that is already known. The precise systematic position of the specimen was not discussed in its description (*1*), nor was its relevance to bird origins, the origin of flight, or other larger questions advertised in the meeting's publicity. Because the specimen is mounted in a restored position, it is difficult to study the original material, or to tell what is original, what is restored, and what it has to tell us apart from its description (*1*), which was mute on these issues. Local museums should flourish and bring culture to every corner of the world. But professional paleontologists and commercial collectors remain strange bedfellows. Neither the public nor the national heritage will be served by publicizing specimens that are not collected, reposited, and documented according to the standards of professional science.

Kevin Padian
Department of Integrative Biology and Curator, Museum of Paleontology, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720–3140, USA. E-mail: kpadian@socrates.berkeley.edu

References

1. D. A. Burnham *et al.*, *Univ. Kans. Paleontol. Contrib.* **13**, 1 (2000).

Intellectual Property Rights

In reference to Eliot Marshall's News Focus article entitled "Patent suit pits postdoc against former mentor" (31 Mar., p. 2399), *Science* should be commended for giving appropriate prominence to such issues involving intellectual property rights in academic institutions.

The material presented in the article leads me to believe that an injustice has been meted out to Joany Chou. First, if Bernard Roizman, Chou's former lab chief, considered himself to be the "sole inventor," then why do important papers supporting the patent have other authors? Second, Judge James Zagel's ruling that the University of Chicago (UC) owns the patent is correct, but it does not debar Chou from "co-inventor status." And third, although UC officials say that "Dr. Chou has been treated fairly," I have reservations about accepting that statement; it is not unheard of for university officials to avoid treading on faculty members' toes by not supporting students and postdocs, however strong the case may be. Nor is it unheard of for faculty advisors to describe accidental discoveries as the outcome of preconceived, systematic, logical questioning in order to claim credit. In many situations, an advisor may not even be aware of important findings until a student brings them to the advisor's attention.

Clear rules need to be followed nationwide conferring co-inventor status to the appropriate students and postdocs involved, and students and postdocs need to be informed of what their share of the credit should be for discoveries that ensue from their hard labor. These steps are essential to restore the faith of junior scientists in the future of science careers, halt the perpetration of questionable scientific practices, and restore the trust between students and faculty advisors that has been greatly eroded by the lure of money.

Vijaykumar S. Kasi
Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, 213 Gazes Cardiac Research Institute, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC 29425, USA. E-mail: vijaykasi@hotmail.com

One thing that Marshall mentions in his article but that is worth reemphasizing is that Chou does hold a patent on the gene $\gamma_1$34.5: patent number US5,834,216, "Screening methods for the identification of inducers and inhibitors of programmed cell death (apoptosis)." Additionally, from my experience as a former member of Roizman's laboratory (student and postdoc) and as someone who has been involved in the patent process with Roizman (well before this lawsuit), for those who made an original intellectual contribution in the laboratory that was patentable, Roizman included them on the patent and they had an opportunity to negotiate with him as to how to divide the credit (future payoff, if any). A quick check of the patent database (*1*) shows 16 patents for Roizman, of which only 5 have Roizman as the sole inventor. If he wasn't intellectually honest, I would expect 16 out of 16, which is his right under the current state of affairs for postdocs and graduate students according to the rule of law.