

Correspondence

Russia's stance on gene-edited humans

The Russian community of geneticists, clinicians and bioethicists have reached a consensus on the use of genome-editing technologies on human embryos and germ cells for clinical purposes (see, for example, *Nature* 574, 465–466; 2019). They consider that such experiments are premature at this point. Their view aligns with the position of the Russian ministry of health and sets the social context for further discussion of the technology.

We agree with the director-general of the World Health Organization (WHO) that comprehensive research is needed into the technical and ethical consequences of using the technology. We support the WHO advisory committee's recommendations to develop global standards for the governance and oversight of human-genome editing, and to create a public registry of clinical research on the effects of applying it to human somatic and germ cells (see *Nature* 575, 415–416; 2019).

Russian science recognizes the basic ethical principles that underpin the decisions of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the WHO and other international organizations, as well as the provisions of the Council of Europe's Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine. These principles will define the system of ethical expertise and inform how Russia regulates the field.

Elena G. Grebenshchikova

Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia.

aika45@yandex.ru

*On behalf of 14 co-signatories; see go.nature.com/2jwmaq8.

We cannot all be ethicists

Sarah Franklin's message that "we must all be ethicists now" is laudable if it sensitizes researchers to the importance of ethical thinking (*Nature* 574, 627–630; 2019). We are concerned, however, that it could be misinterpreted to mean that expertise in ethics is no longer necessary for discussing issues pertaining to science and technology. This implication is dangerous in a society in which there is a mounting distrust of institutions and expert knowledge.

Franklin seems to us to conflate the field of enquiry of bioethics with bioethicists' participation in public bodies tasked with addressing science and technology governance. Expertise in bioethics cannot be improvised. Bioethicists are trained in the normative evaluation of biotechnologies, medical practices and other technologies. Bioethics aims to address questions related to what should or should not be done with regard to a particular issue. It is essential, therefore, that we protect the expertise that we have gathered through our training and experience.

Silvia Camporesi King's College London, London, UK.
silvia.camporesi@kcl.ac.uk

Giulia Cavaliere Lancaster University, UK.

Ukraine open index maps local citations

The Open Ukrainian Citation Index (OUCI; <http://ouci.dntb.gov.ua/en>) was launched this month by Ukraine's ministry of education and science, in conjunction with the country's State Scientific and Technical Library. This database could be particularly useful for tracking relationships between findings that concern regional topics and target domestic audiences, which are typically published in Ukrainian journals (see also A. J. Nederhof *Scientometrics* 66, 81–100; 2006).

Scholarly communication systems often fall short in revealing knowledge networks if their bibliographic and citation data are not in machine-readable form. The OUCI database, which comprises citations from all publishers that use Crossref's Cited-by service, corrects this problem. It upholds the aims of the Initiative for Open Citations, a collaboration of scholarly publishers, researchers and other stakeholders. It is accessible to researchers and the public, and it accounts for citations between publications (DOI to DOI) without the need to open the source articles. The database contains information from databases such as Scopus and the Web of Science, and can also be searched in English.

Dmytro Cheberkus Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine.

Serhii Nazarovets State Scientific and Technical Library of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine.
serhii.nazarovets@gmail.com

Jordan: networking across generations

Networks for young people interested in science rarely connect with societies for senior scientists, such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Society for the Advancement of Science and Technology in the Arab World (SASTA) and The World Academy of Sciences (see A. Orben *Nature* 573, 465; 2019). As president of SASTA, I offer an example of a remedy from an unexpected source – Jordan, a country at the heart of crisis and displacement in the Middle East.

The Phi Science Institute is a network of young scientists across the Arab world. It holds an annual conference – Connect for Science – at which senior and junior scientists and students communicate with one another on an equal footing (<https://pris.phiscience.co>). The wisdom of the old meets the curiosity and enthusiasm of the young. Role models are set up for researchers at the start of their careers.

As mature scientists, we owe it to the next generation of researchers and to society to use our expertise to make a difference. I often invite well-known scientists to talk to my students, over Skype or in person. For example, US Nobel laureate Brian Kobilka shared his everyday experiences in the laboratory, and Magdalena Skipper, *Nature's* first female editor, told them her personal story.

Rana Dajani Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan.
rdajani@hu.edu.jo