LETTERS

Working Toward Meritocracy in Italy

I READ WITH ANGUISH THE “OPEN LETTER TO SENATOR RITA LEVI-MONTALCIN” by R. Clementi et al. (21 March, p. 1615), which was signed by 776 Italian researchers holding temporary contracts, lamenting the lack of stability and meritocracy. As a researcher, clinician, and academi-
cian who has worked under different systems in Italy and abroad, I share
their concerns. I am fully aware of the heavy limitations of the Italian sys-

tem. However, as the past Chair of the Health Committee of the Italian Senate, I must take exception to their statement that the left-wing govern-
ment’s intent never went beyond mere words. In my capacity as Senator,
I have promoted measures that enhance transparency and meritocracy in
the selection of projects and that allocate dedicated resources to young
investigators. The 2007 national budget law allocated €15 million to
projects submitted by biomedical researchers under 40 years of age. The
projects are to be selected by an international committee composed of
scientists who are also under 40, and who will judge the proposals
strictly on their merits. Another measure, inserted in the 2008 national
budget law, designates €81 million to projects presented, again, by
researchers under 40 in all areas of intellectual endeavor.

True, in spite of the above-mentioned total of €96 million, Italy is
still behind in research investment. We invest only 1.1% of the GDP in
research, less than the average 2% for Europe, which already compares
poorly with the 2.7% for the United States and over 3% for Japan.

Without minimizing the rightful complaint of the Italian
researchers, I do not believe that the correct way to proceed is to hire
everyone who is currently working with temporary contracts, but to
start applying the rules of peer review consistently. By evaluating only
on the basis of merit, we will give dignity to valuable scientists, and we
will promote the intellectual, economic, and cultural growth of Italy.

IGNAZIO R. MARINO
Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, PA 19107, USA.

The Emerging World of Wikis

WE NOTED WITH INTEREST THE LETTER “Preserving accuracy in GenBank,” (M. I. Bidartondo et al., 21 March, p. 1616) and the
related News of the Week story “Proposal to ‘wikify’ GenBank meets stiff resistance” (E. Pennisi, 21 March, p. 1598). David Lipman’s
fears that wikifying GenBank “would be chaos” are widely shared, but those fears
should be balanced by the realization that individual curators cannot fully encompass
the collective expertise of the larger scientific
community. Serious users of GenBank use it
as a starting point for in-depth analysis with
new bioinformatic tools and reviews of more
recent work. These users often learn more about
the data than the initial depositors or
curation staff. This valuable information—
hidden in notebooks and rarely published—is
being lost to future researchers. A parallel
wiki-based structure provides one way of cap-
turing these data.

We are working on such systems, including
EcoliWiki (1), the community annotation
component of EcoliHub (2), and a Gene
Ontology Normal Usage Tracking System
(GONUTS) (3), a browser and annotation sys-
tem for Gene Ontology (4). We regard these
and similar efforts (5–8) as experiments to test
wiki-based curation. So far, the challenge is
not chaos but lack of participation. Thus, we
are also experimenting with curation by undergraduates supervised by an experienced scient-
ist. Integrating annotation and genomics education leverages how we teach critical thinking
about the literature, accelerates the pace of
curation, and provides institutional incentives
for established scientists to participate.

Nevertheless, we understand that chang-
ing the GenBank model should not be done
lightly. There are well-established expecta-
tions about GenBank, and wikifying it could
be quite disruptive. Perhaps GenBank could
support an arm’s length relationship to wikis
via the LinkOut service. We look forward to
ongoing discussion of how community curation
could be added to GenBank. In the meantime, we encourage the 250 scientists
who signed the Bidartondo et al. letter to
help us build wiki-based fungal curation via
GO at GONUTS.
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B. Shneiderman’s Perspective, “Science 2.0” (7 March, p. 1349), is quite right to identify the value of new observations of human interaction made possible by the advent of the Internet. However, Shneiderman’s assertion that these data require some radically new methodology, which he calls “Science 2.0,” is apparently based on a misunderstanding of the scope of existing scientific methods.

Shneiderman says that Science 2.0 will address questions of human interaction that “cannot be studied adequately in laboratory conditions,” because “the interaction among variables undermines the validity of reductionist methods.” Instead, data for analysis must be “collected in real settings.” This sounds exactly like approaches that are already practiced, with great success, by researchers in the fields of (to name but a few) ecology, evolutionary biology, geology, paleontology, economics, cosmology, and social science.

Indeed, what Shneiderman calls Science 1.0 has always included methods beyond simple controlled experiments, such as inference from observation of integrated natural systems and the careful use of “natural experiments” (1) to test and eliminate competing hypotheses.

Jeremy B. Yoder
Department of Biological Sciences, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83844–3051, USA.

Response
I agree that the natural sciences are based on more than just replicable, controlled laboratory experimental studies, and that observational methods play a key role in the natural and social sciences (1). However, the interventional methods as practiced in design science studies of sociotechnical systems have novel elements. In addition to “natural experiments,” such as when the FaceBook managers change the deletion rules or eBay administrators update their fraud control mechanisms, I was advocating research-oriented interventions to develop predictive models.

Amazon and NetFlix designers conduct many studies to improve their user interfaces...