there is a significant decrease in this ratio with increase in the degree of metamorphism/metasomatism. Whichever is correct it can scarcely be said that strontium isotope measurements offer a clear demonstration that carbonatites are not mobilized limestones.

We do not suggest that carbonatites are either limestone xenoliths or mobilized limestones but we doubt that the studies of strontium isotopic composition prove that they are not.

This work is supported by grants from the Canadian National Research Council and the Ontario Research Foundation to York, Farquhar and Gittins. The skarn specimen was kindly provided by Prof. D. M. Shaw of McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario.

A. HAYATSU
D. YORK
R. M. Farquhar
J. GITTINS

Division of Geophysics,

Department of Geology, University of Toronto.

¹ Powell, J. L., Hurley, P. M., and Fairbairn, H. W., Nature, 196, 1085 (1962).

² Hamilton, E. I., and Deans, T., Nature, 198, 776 (1963). * Powell, J. L., Proc. Intern. Min. Assoc., India, 1964 (in the press).

GEOCHEMISTRY

Estimation of Elapsed Time since a Certain Climatic Change for Lake Vanda

WILSON¹ has considered the estimation of elapsed time since a climatic change for Lake Vanda (77° 35' S., 161° 39' E.), which is 5 miles long, 1 mile wide and occupies the lowest part of the Wright Valley, an ice-free valley in Victoria Land, Antarctica.

The estimation procedure makes use of the equation:

$$C = [M/(Dt)^{\frac{1}{2}}] \exp[-h^{\frac{2}{4}}(4Dt)]$$

where C is the concentration of calcium chloride at distance h from bottom after an elapsed time t, h is the distance above bottom, D is the diffusion coefficient of calcium chloride (0.68 cm²/day at 10° -see ref. 2), and M is the total mass of calcium chloride per unit area.

Measurements were made on the concentration of calcium chloride at a distance h from bottom. Originally the data were presented by Wilson¹ in the form of a graph, but more recently he has presented them (personal communication) as in Table 1.

T	able 1
h	C
(ft.)	(equiv./l.)
0	2.36
5	$2 \cdot 28$
10	2.12
15	1.93
25	1.53
35	0.99
45	0.473
50	0.306
55	0.142
60	0.0604
65	0.0305
70	0.0530

h is the distance above bottom in feet, and C is the concentration of calcium chloride. It should be noted that Wilson (personal communication) gives these data and points out that in Fig. 2 of ref. 1 there is an error in the concentration scale of about 0.5. This reduces the former good fit for approximately 1,200 years to the smaller value given in this communication.

It should be noted that the equation involved can be written:

$$\log C = -h^2/4Dt + \log[M/(Dt)^{\frac{1}{2}}]$$

where log refers to natural logarithm. For the values $0 = h_0 \leq h_1 \leq \ldots \leq h_n$ we have associated C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_n , respectively. We write:

$$W_i = \log(C_i/C_0) = -h_i^2/4Dt$$
 for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$

The value of t^* which minimizes the sum of squares $\sum_{i=1}^{n} (W_i^* - W_i)^2$, where W_i^* is computed from the observed values $C_0^*, C_1^*, \ldots, C_n^*$ of C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_n , is:

$$t^* = \frac{-\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i^4}{4D \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i^2 W_i^*}$$

If we assume that $W_i = -h_i^2/4Dt + \varepsilon_i$, where ε_i is normally distributed with mean 0 and variance σ^2 for $i=1, 2, \ldots, n$, then $1/t^*$ is normally distributed with mean 1/t and variance $16D^2\sigma^2/\sum_{i=1}^n h_i^4$. An unbiased

estimate of σ^2 is s^2 , where :

$$(n-1) s^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{i}^{*2} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_{i} W_{i}^{*}\right)^{2} / \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_{i}^{4}$$

It will follow that:

$$(1/t^* - 1/t) \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n h_i^* \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} / 4Ds \right] = T(n-1)$$

where T(n-1) is the Student t-distribution with n-1degrees of freedom. Therefore, if $T_{\alpha}(n-1)$ is such that Prob $(T(n-1) \ge T_{\alpha}(n-1)) = \alpha/2$, then a $(1-\alpha)100$ per cent confidence interval for t has:

$$\frac{t^{*}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}h_{i}^{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}h_{i}^{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 4Dt^{*}sT_{a}(n-1)} \leq t \leq \frac{t^{*}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}h_{i}^{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}h_{i}^{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 4Dt^{*}sT_{a}(n-1)}$$

when $0 < 4Dt^{*}sT_{a}(n-1) < \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}h_{i}^{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$

The method of estimation used by Wilson¹ was simply trial and error. He observed graphically that the observed points fell between the graph for t = 1,000 and t = 1,500and that t = 1,200 looked like a good fit. By the described statistical estimation method one obtains $t^* = 984$ years and 95 per cent confidence interval 576 $\leq t \leq 3,360$. This is a much more satisfactory method of analysis since it gives an estimate with the optimal properties of least squares as well as a measure of the accuracy of the estimate.

CHARLES DEWITT ROBERTS

National Institute of Arthritic and Metabolic Diseases,

Bethesda, Maryland.

¹ Wilson, A. T., Nature, 201, 176 (1964).

² Handbook of Chemistry and Physics (Chemical Rubber Publishing Co., Cleveland, Ohio, 1954).

DR. ROBERTS's treatment of my data gives additional confirmation to my tenet that the chemical gradients found in Lake Vanda can be explained by chemical diffusion and that such chemical composition profiles in Antarctic lakes can provide valuable palæoclimatic information¹.

I would, however, like to make a few comments on the treatment used by Dr. Roberts. The model I used, and that adopted by Dr. Roberts, was diffusion from a planar source of negligible thickness on the bottom of a rectangular trough of infinite volume. This assumes the Lako has a flat bottom with vertical sides. As my Fig. 2 (ref. 1) and the mathematics of Dr. Roberts show, this is, in fact, a reasonable first approximation. Dr. Roberts is concerned with secondary refinements, and to do this one cannot give all