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Open Letter to Senator Rita Levi-Montalcini

WE ARE A GROUP OF RESEARCHERS (1). WE WRITE THIS LETTER TO YOU WITH THE UTMOST respect and gratitude for what you have done and still do for research in Italy. We appreciated all the statements of intent of the past governments as well as the current one: more money for research, transparent competitions, and the like. But all this never went beyond mere words.

Professor, in Italy there are 60,000 university researchers with temporary contracts! This is no “marginal phenomenon”—we make up 50% of the university labor force.

Unfortunately, the situation is no better in research agencies. We do research work, lecture, supervise students writing graduation theses, publish articles, attend congresses, and draw up appeals for funds (in which our names do not even appear).

We work at least as much as long-term employees but we do not have the same rights. In Italy there are only a few open competitions, and, even worse, they often look like farces: The name of the winner is known even before the call for expression of interest is issued! Meritocracy in Italy is an empty word seldom translated into reality. Fast university careers are only for the chosen ones or the descendants of families traditionally connected with the university. Everybody knows that it takes good opportunities to improve one’s skills, but opportunities are not for everyone according to their merits. And the situation is even worse for women.

As we strive to defeat cancer, discover new molecules and genes, develop new software, support an ever-changing culture, and identify new ways to teach and learn, remember that achieving these goals is partly due to the work of university researchers with temporary contracts, who have worked for years hoping to finally obtain a job that would give them economic stability and freedom.

University researchers with temporary contracts are not free. They have to make compromises or their contracts won’t be renewed; they have to withdraw from open competitions to let a “chosen one” be hired; they have to accept that their data are published without their names among the authors. They do all this to survive. We will be a generation of pensioners without a pension.

Then, maybe, the state will take care of us. For many years, many people (and governments) forgot all about us. Researchers who are now 30, 40, 45 years old still have temporary contracts and may now be too old for a long-term contract as university researchers. Many among us have had a temporary contract for 10 to 15 years; they have had many different kinds of short-term contracts and their work has been evaluated every year before their contract could be renewed. We wonder what else we have to endure before we are considered suitable for a long-term contract.

Professor, with your usual strength of mind you will certainly be able to pass on the message that the university in Italy can be saved only if this problem is solved.

Thank you in advance for your understanding and support.
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Reference
1. This Letter has been signed by 776 researchers with temporary contracts in Italy or abroad. The complete list is available as Supporting Online Material at www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/319/5870/1615a/DC1.

Response

I AM WELL AWARE OF THE PRECARIOUS SITUATION in Italy regarding researchers with temporary employment contracts. During the approval of Italy’s 2008 Budget, I supported measures to stabilize employment for those working under temporary contracts. Although the government was not able to invest heavily in this expenditure, the Budget Law did allocate funds to reduce unsteady employment.

I hope the new government will be able to ameliorate this long-standing problem, and I also assure my continued support during the next legislature.

RITA LEVI-MONTALCINI
President, European Brain Research Institute, Via del Fosso di Fiorano 64, 00143 Rome, Italy.
Preserving Accuracy in GenBank

GENBANK, THE PUBLIC REPOSITORY FOR nucleotide and protein sequences, is a critical resource for molecular biology, evolutionary biology, and ecology. While some attention has been drawn to sequence errors (1), common annotation errors also reduce the value of this database. In fact, for organisms such as fungi, which are notoriously difficult to identify, up to 20% of DNA sequence records may have erroneous lineage designations in GenBank (2). Gene function annotation in protein sequence databases is similarly error-prone (3, 4). Because identity and function of new sequences are often determined by bioinformatic analyses, both types of errors are propagated into new accessions, leading to long-term degradation of the quality of the database.

Currently, primary sequence data are annotated by the authors of those data, and can only be reannotated by the same authors. This is inefficient and unsustainable over the long term as authors eventually leave the field. Although it is possible to link third-party databases to GenBank records, this is a short-term solution that has little guarantee of permanence. Similarly, the current third-party annotation option in GenBank (TPA) complicates rather than solves the problem by creating an identical record with a new annotation, while leaving the original record unflagged and unlinked to the new record.

Since the origin of public zoological and botanical specimen collections, an open system of cumulative annotation has evolved, whereby the original name is retained, but additional opinion is directly appended and used for filing and retrieval. This was needed as new specimens and analyses allowed for reevaluation of older specimens and the original depositors became unavailable. The time has come for the public sequence database to incorporate a community-curated, cumulative annotation process that allows third parties to improve the annotations of sequences when warranted by published peer-reviewed analyses.

M. I. BIDARTONDO ET AL.
Imperial College London and Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew
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