# THIS WEEK

### **EDITORIALS**

FUTURE SHOCKS The enduring lure of time travel and other fictions **p.594** 

WORLD VIEW The United States heads in the right direction on science **p.595** 



## All together now

Proposals to bring hydrofluorocarbons under the auspices of the Montreal Protocol provide a simple test of the international community's commitment to tackling climate change.

Construction of the second sec

As the latest negotiations over the future of the Montreal Protocol wrapped up in Bangkok on 25 October, India found itself increasingly isolated, and rightly so. On the table were a pair of amendments that would pull the regulation of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) out of the United Nations climate framework and into the Montreal Protocol's portfolio. HFCs replaced the infamous ozone-eating chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), and were successfully created and deployed under the protocol to protect the ozone layer, which is now on the mend. However, they are powerful greenhouse gases. The simplest solution is to use the same tool that bred HFCs to phase them out. India took the lead in blocking consideration of the amendments.

In all likelihood, their acceptance is just a matter of time. Most countries have long supported the idea, and early objectors such as Brazil and South Africa have come around. US President Barack Obama brought Chinese President Xi Jinping on board in June, and the leaders of the Group of 20 (G20) nations — including India — gave their endorsement in September. The fact that India is on the losing side of this debate makes its renewed intransigence all the more galling. But there is hope: after the September G20 meeting, Obama and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh agreed to launch negotiations over the issue.

Without action, HFC usage will rise sharply owing to more demand for refrigeration and air conditioning in the developing world. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's recent assessment of the science underlying global warming highlighted the challenges ahead, and its assessments of adaptation and mitigation measures will soon follow. The message is clear: delaying action will increase the severity of climate impacts, and India is well aware that these are likely to hit hardest in developing countries. Another year of haggling will probably not change the outcome of negotiations, but it will cost the world precious time.

Meanwhile, many in industry are gearing up to replace HFCs with chemicals such as HFO-1234yf, jointly developed by the chemical giants Dupont in Wilmington, Delaware, and Honeywell in Morris Township, New Jersey. Created in response to European Union regulations to limit the climate impact of vehicle refrigerants, the chemical is some 325 times less powerful as a greenhouse gas than the current industry standard.

More work is needed to replace HFCs in other applications, but the Montreal Protocol's job is to harness this work and accelerate the change. One concern in the debate is how much it will cost to shift industry towards climate-friendly chemicals, and who will pay. The treaty has a well-trodden pathway: developed countries pioneer workable solutions and then help developing countries with the transition. Another concern is little more than a turf war between the Montreal Protocol and the UN climate convention, which has jurisdiction over greenhouse gases. The proposed amendments would address this by shifting management of the chemicals into the Montreal Protocol while leaving the accounting to the convention.

Delegates at the Bangkok meeting called for a technical report on

#### "At stake is our legitimately shaken confidence in multilateralism."

HFC alternatives and scheduled a workshop on the issue for next year. That leaves the door open to a decision before the next headline climate summit in Paris in 2015. Success on this front might restore confidence in the multilateral process and build

some much-needed momentum going into the talks. It has been clear for some time that it will be difficult, if not impossible, for the world to achieve a singular solution through the UN climate negotiations. Climate mitigation has become decentralized, and countries must use all of the tools at their disposal to reduce emissions. With a little success, diplomats may find it easier to increase political ambitions and fold these efforts into a viable climate treaty.

At stake in the Montreal Protocol talks is not just the future of one treaty, but also our legitimately shaken confidence in multilateralism. If the world cannot agree on something as simple as this, what hope is there of meaningful cooperation on the difficult issues that lie ahead?

### Time to talk

Online discussion is an essential aspect of the post-publication review of findings.

Scientists are an opinionated bunch. From the cutting criticisms they make during peer review to bold questioning after a conference presentation, the rough and tumble of academic debate is seen as a crucial part of scientific progress. So where is the online equivalent for published papers?

To be sure, there are lively debates on blogs and social media about the merits of published work. Individual communities have formed their own central areas for engaged and informed criticism of peerreviewed results. For example, Haldane's Sieve, a site for evolutionary geneticists, is always busy and encourages authors to write short explanations of preprint abstracts. But click on the published homes of many of these papers — the websites of the journals in which they appear — and you will find digital tumbleweed.

In recent years, authors and readers have been able to post online comments about *Nature* papers on our site. Few bother. At the Public

Library of Science, where the commenting system is more successful, only 10% of papers have comments, and most of those have only one.

Last week, the US National Center for Biotechnology Information became the latest publisher to attempt to corral this online discussion. It is opening up PubMed, its online repository of abstracts of some 23 million scientific papers, to comments. If online commenting on research papers or abstracts can flourish anywhere, surely it will be at PubMed, the site at which so many biomedical researchers begin their investigation of the literature. Visibility should be high, after the site emerges from its restricted pilot stage. And next week will see the launch of bioRxiv, the latest attempt to mimic the physics preprint site arXiv for biomedical sciences; this site will also encourage comments.

The early signs for the PubMed trial are promising. Among the first 200 comments, there has been some apparently useful self-criticism: for example, Andrew Kniss of the University of Wyoming in Laramie, posted on his own 2006 paper, saying that "our conclusions with respect to field management of the disease went beyond what the limited data could support".

What PubMed has going for it is high traffic. But what has yet to emerge, and what could dictate how scientists use it, are the boundaries of online conduct that it will set, and how it will tune into the constructive criticism needed for genuine post-publication review of findings amid the noise and static that passes for much online debate.

Alarmed at the tenor of criticism when it concerns misconduct, some editors have tried to rein in online discussion, and to bring it within the limits of conventional debate. But attempts to dictate terms are likely to backfire. In a recent editorial in the journal ACS Nano, for example, the editors asserted that "the numbers of blogs, twitter messages, etc. in which individuals accuse others of academic fraud are steadily rising" — although they did not provide evidence for this. And they asked that suspicions of plagiarism or data manipulation be reported directly to a journal, rather than posted openly online (W. J. Parak *et al. ACS Nano* 7, 8313–8316; 2013). It was others' "privilege" to be able to comment on a journal's decision on a blog afterwards, the editorial added.

Although written with concern for the fair treatment of scientists who suffer damage to their reputation when comments are made irresponsibly, the editorial raised the hackles of chemistry bloggers who have

#### "It makes sense to digitally tie the research and the comments together."

pointed out egregious examples of image manipulation in papers — and who understandably consider that it is they, as much as the journals, who are doing the community the service (see go.nature.com/cplnfd). It is better to ask that debate be civil, responsible and courteous, than that it not appear online at all.

Does it matter just where online these discussions take place? Not in the short term — even the most obscure blog discussion can catch a wave and throw an academic debate into the mainstream. But if a longer-term goal is to leave some permanent signpost to help others navigate the scientific landscape, then it does make sense to digitally tie the research and the comments together.

For this to happen, PubMed Commons and digital publishers either need to become a hub for separate online discussions, or to generate community engagement directly at the sites of research papers or abstracts — something that has so far been lacking. Ultimately, the success of this worthy effort is incumbent on us all: so do visit and comment on your paper and others. Help the experiment to work. ■

### Playful paradoxes

A half-century of Doctor Who has shown the dramatic possibilities of science in the arts.

ovember sees perhaps the most significant golden anniversary to have been celebrated anywhere or anywhen in the entirety of time and space. Yes — it will have been 50 years since the broadcast of the first episode of *Doctor Who*, the adventures of a character who has become television's most celebrated time traveller. On page 620 of this issue, cosmologist Andrew Jaffe looks at the facts and fictions of time travel as an enduring trope in fiction. As he notes, *Doctor Who*'s generally gleeful disregard of time-travel paradoxes is all for the good. There is a danger of taking such things much too seriously. What is more important is the story itself and the situations it offers its participants.

In other words, time travel might well be impossible in real life, but so what? Playing with its paradoxes is fun and inspires millions who might not otherwise have done so to consider its possibilities - dramatic, if not physical. There is, nonetheless, a valid point to be made: if time travel is unbelievable, isn't there a danger that readers or viewers cannot suspend disbelief for the duration? Well, yes, but if the writing is good enough, the audience can be carried along for the ride as long as it lasts, never questioning the reality of dragons or dilithium crystals, nor noting the delicious irony of a starship engineer in Star Trek who complains that "ye cannae change the laws of physics, Captain". This is why authors, artists and film-makers try their best to get right small details most likely to pull audiences up rather than worrying about the overarching conceit of (say) time travel. As zoologist Adam Summers recalled when he was brought in by Pixar to consult on their animation Finding Nemo (2003), artists pay great attention to detail to make their acts of world creation believable, even if fish don't actually talk (Nature 427, 672-673; 2004).

Some authors, however, baulk at bringing unbelievable elements into their stories, especially if they see themselves as having regard for science. In the 1980 novel *Timescape*, real-life physicist Gregory Benford grants himself the allowance for information to be transmitted backwards through time, if not the transfer of people or machinery — a limitation that he exploits to perfection in the pay-off. People in a future world doomed by ecological catastrophe remain doomed, even though they transmit their warnings so that a past world can save itself.

Another staple of science fiction is the ability of spacecraft to travel enormous distances faster than the speed of light — something else that is almost certainly impossible. In a note to his 1986 novel *The Songs of Distant Earth*, the late Arthur C. Clarke writes that it "now seems almost certain that in the real universe we may never exceed the velocity of light. Even the very closest star systems will always be decades or centuries apart: no Warp Six will ever get you from one episode to another in time for next week's instalment. The great Producer in the Sky did not arrange his program planning that way." Clarke uses this limitation to poignant dramatic effect; not that it prevented him from exploiting such improbabilities as tapping vacuum energy or long-term suspended animation.

Perhaps the most surprising critic of such technological fixes was the great hobbitmonger himself, J. R. R. Tolkien, as revealed in his unfinished story *The Notion Club Papers* (published posthumously in 1992 in *Sauron Defeated*, edited by his son and literary executor Christopher Tolkien). Much of the story is a discussion between academics and writers on the dishonesty of using scientific-sounding MacGuffins to get one from here to there. If one insists on doing such a thing, one might as well dream oneself to Mars or wave a wizardly wand. The story centres on criticism of H. G. Wells's *The First Men in the Moon* (1901), in which the protagonist, one Dr Cavor, invents a material, cavorite, that provides insulation against gravity. "Gravity can't be treated like that," complains one of Tolkien's characters. "It's fundamental. It's a statement by the Universe of where you are in the Universe, and the Universe can't be tricked by a surname with *ite* stuck

#### • NATURE.COM To comment online, click on Editorials at: go.nature.com/xhungy

on the end, nor by any such abracadabra." Which suggests, perhaps surprisingly, that even if time travel and warp drives are impossible, the world's best-selling fantasy author knew a thing or two about the general theory of relativity.