

## Do not try this at home

SIR — Scientific publication entails grave social responsibility. The reckless publication of “Laboratory simulation of cosmic string formation in the early Universe using superfluid  $^3\text{He}$ ” (ref. 1) brought at least one physics PhD to perilous attacks of hysteria and threatens his marriage because his wife has to keep throwing cold water on him. I know. That unfortunate scientist is my husband.

After his first attack of giggles and tears, I, a mere ecologist, approached the triggering paper with due trepidation. As I understand it, the authors see a thimbleful of liquid helium as a literal microcosm, a model of the Universe at the moment of ‘creation’, and elaborate a mathematical model of the creation process, based on observations of the events in the dab of helium.

As a mere ecologist, I had questions about this paper. For example, ecologists grapple with problems of scale and magnitude; aren’t there problems in physics jumping from a scale of about a couple millilitres in volume to gazillion cubic kilometres? Don’t fundamentally different processes sometimes occur at these vastly different scales?

Another example: ecologists have an obsession about verifying their models. How

would this model be verified? Has a ‘superstring’ ever been seen at cosmological distances or is this concept applicable only to a particular species of helium in a particular microhabitat?

Each time I asked such a question, my spouse would relapse into hysterics. Our relationship changed. Now we look on each other with apprehension and dread, not good elements in a marriage<sup>2</sup>.

*Nature* needs a special edition similar to *Journal of Irreproducible Results*. In addition to *Nature Genetics*, *Nature Avant Garde* could be published for papers such as Bäuerle *et al.*<sup>1</sup> and the famous Benveniste lamentation of watery memories of *solutes perdus*. You could display a conspicuous warning on the cover about the ‘nature’ of the contents and thus fulfil your grave social responsibility.

**Deborah Wallace**

549 West 123 Street, Apt 16F,  
New York,  
New York 10027, USA

REPLY — To take your points in reverse order, the *Journal of Irreproducible Results* is ruled out because in cosmology there are no irreproducible results. There has only ever been one experiment, still running, and we are latecomers watching from the back.

By the irreproachable standards of ecology, there is very little that we can test. Nor do we need large scales to see that. The Earth is tied to the Sun by gravity, we suppose. That has not been ‘tested’ in the laboratory sense, say by moving the Earth and checking the force/distance relation. Gravity simply fits the facts better than any other speculation.

Although there is as yet virtually no solid evidence for cosmic strings, if (and that’s a real if) the Universe did in fact undergo the phase transitions currently thought possible, then the nucleation process would have created grain boundaries in the structure of space which should have survived as cosmic strings. Their large mass would certainly help to explain the present uneven distribution of the galaxies. We clearly cannot perform experiments that reproduce the Big Bang. But, outside the pages of the above journal, if we are to subscribe to scientific method then we have to believe that similar conditions lead to similar results, and make the best of what we can do. Yes, in superfluid helium-3 we do have a model microcosm, the most complex system simple enough for us already to have a ‘theory of everything’. If we force it through the appropriate transition then, via the same process mathematically by which cosmic

1. Bäuerle, C., Bunkov, Yu. M., Fisher, S. N., Godfrin, H. & Pickett, G. R. *Nature* **382**, 332–334 (1996)
2. Wallace, D. J. *Irrepro. Results* **41**(3), 10–12 (1996).

Does yur autoated  
DNA seqencer leave  
u guessing?

