
How chimps use tools
579

SPORE prize essay
584

reviewers appreciate the quality and the innovativeness of research. Of course, not every paper can introduce a Theory of Relativity. But we must focus on quality rather than quantity if we are to advance the world's intellectual capital. **CLAUS-CHRISTIAN CARBON**

Department of General Psychology and Methodology, University of Bamberg, Markusplatz 3, D-96047 Bamberg, Germany. E-mail: ccc@experimental-psychology.com

References

1. C. C. Carbon, *Curr. Sci.* **94**, 1234 (2008).
2. J. E. Hirsch, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **102**, 16569 (2005).
3. DFG, Press release 7 (23 February 2010); www.dfg.de/en/service/press/press_releases/2010/pressemitteilung_nr_07/index.html.

Fundamental Change in German Research Policy

UNTIL RECENTLY, AN ESSENTIAL INDICATOR in the evaluation of grant applicants by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), Germany's leading research foundation, was the quantity and impact of the applicant's publications. This policy fit the increasing attention paid to Web of Science–listed publications, impact factors, and the h-index for competitive funding in science (*1*, *2*). The rationale is clear: On the basis of such variables, it is possible to compare performances and to provide a foundation for decisions. However, the process overlooks one fundamental point: the content of research.

The essence of the "Einsteins" of science history was surely not the quantity of their publications, but the quality of their research ideas. Ideas are hard to quantify—they are even harder to compare. But wise peer-referees can qualify them.

The DFG has recently taken an important step toward valuing content. The organization has changed its policy for evaluating research grants by restricting references in forthcoming applications to five of the authors' most important publications and limiting reports of finished projects to the two most important publications per year (*3*). This helps

CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

Reports: "Decorrelated neuronal firing in cortical microcircuits" by A. S. Ecker *et al.* (29 January, p. 584). In Fig. 1E, the labels (r_{sc} values and colored dots) were accidentally applied in reverse order. The correct labels (color *x*/color *y*/r_{sc}) should read for the first row from left to right: green/light blue/–0.01; dark blue/light blue/0.02; dark blue/green/–0.14; for the second row from left to right: red/light blue/–0.01; red/green/0.21; red/dark blue/0.04.

Reports: "Metagenome of a versatile chemolithoautotroph from expanding oceanic dead zones" by D. A. Walsh *et al.* (23 October 2009, p. 578). There are two changes to the names of sequences within tree 1 in Fig. 1A. The first two Eastern South Pacific clones are ESP60-K23I-54 (DQ810449), not ESP200-K23I-54, and ESP60-Khe2-29 (DQ810511), not K23II-30 (DQ810478).

Reports: "Parasite treatment affects maternal investment in sons," by T. E. Reed *et al.* (19 September 2008, p. 1681). The sample size of the experimental group receiving sham treatment in 2006 should read $n = 20$ nests, not 22 nests (see "Experimental methods" in the corrected Supporting Online Material). Therefore, the total sample size quoted in the main text should be $n = 81$ nests, not 83.