

5. Gabe, M., Martoja, M. and Saint Girons, H., *Ann. Biol.*, 1964, 3, 303.
6. Gabe, M. and Rancurel, P., *Archs Anat. microsc.*, 1964, 53, 225.
7. Gabe, M. and Martoja, M., *Archs Anat. microsc.*, 1962, 51, 107.
8. Unsicker, K., *Cell Tiss. Res.*, 1976, 165, 477.
9. Hillarp, N. A. and Hökfelt, B., *J. Histochem. Cytochem.*, 1955, 3, 1.
10. Tramezzani, J. A., Chiocchio, S. and Wassermann, G. F., *Acta Physiol. latinoam.*, 1964, 14, 122.
11. Ghosh, A., *Int. Rev. Cytol.*, 1977, 49, 253.
12. Laforgia, V. and Varano, L., *J. Morphol.*, 1982, 171, 79.

NEWS

TREATING WATER WITH OZONE

... "Unhappy with drinking water that sometimes tastes 'rotten,' [Clinton, III.] is joining a small but growing list of American communities that have turned down from chlorine to ozone for purification. . . . The city of 8,000 people spent \$10,000 to study ozone water treatment and invited customers to taste the results. About 50 people tried the water and all 'commented on how clear it was and how good it tasted,' Tony Taubert [Clinton, III. Water Commissioner] said. So the city has decided to take bids on an ozone treatment system to kill bacteria and break down organic compounds. Twenty American communities already are using ozone, a highly active form

of oxygen, to treat their water, said Rip G. Rice, a member of the Internatl. Ozone Assn. New ozone treatment systems are being installed in at least six others. . . . Ozone is more effective than chlorine in removing organic material that affects the quality of water. Taubert said, and it does not produce the cancer-causing compounds that have been linked to chlorination." [(In *New York Times* 2 Aug. 84, p. c11) (Reproduced with permission from: Press Digest, *Current Contents*® , No. 48, November 26, 1984, p. 16, Published by the Institute for Scientific Information® , Philadelphia, PA, USA.)]

CITATION ANALYSIS AND THE RANKING OF JOURNALS

... "While citation analysis shares many basic limitations with prestige analysis, it holds more promise as a useful technique for ranking journals. It has more intuitive appeal. It is also better suited to answer the kinds of questions which generally lead to efforts to rank journals—for example, the extent to which other professionals turn to specific periodicals in their own writing. The need to rank professional journals within scientific disciplines seems likely to grow. This will be particularly true as universities and private research agencies seek to improve their measures of individual productivity. But when journal rankings are used in this way, care must be taken to avoid the ecological fallacy of assuming that the quality of an

article can be determined solely from the quality of the journal in which it was published. [Studies] suggest greater variation in the quality of articles published within than between journals. Furthermore, even the best measures of journal rankings are relatively crude. In most cases scholars would be well advised to rank journals in sets or clusters rather than by assigning artificially precise indicators of rank" [(Ralph A. Weisheit (Illinois State U.) & Robert M. Regoli (U. Colorado) in *Scholarly Publishing* 15(4): 313-25, Jul. 84. (Reproduced with permission from: Press Digest, *Current Contents*® , No. 49, December 3, 1984, p. 11, Published by the Institute for Scientific Information® , Philadelphia, PA, USA.)]
