

Re: Species Resurrection

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2007-12/msg00195.html>

- *From:* "Alan Meyer" <ameyer2@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 29 Dec 2007 14:28:25 -0500 (EST)
-

"DK" <dk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:fkke6\\$plj\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:fkke6plj1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

...
But the devil is in the details. And thus far the details are: 1)
There is a
lot of disagreement on what is signal and what is contamination or
sequencing errors, 2) only small bits of few individual genes had been
positively identified, 3) chemistry of DNA preservation sets its
limits –
if there is no DNA to begin with, sequencing it is gonna be
problematic.
4) getting non-coding sequences right is a lot more trouble than
known ORFs.
...

I think you are undoubtedly right in these and the other points you
raised in your earlier response to Tim's posting.

There is a foreseeable path to reconstruction of extinct
viruses and bacteria – if we can reconstruct the DNA sequences
correctly. Eukaroyotes are another matter. Multicellular eukaroyotes
and advanced organisms are that much harder still.

We can't foresee at this time how to solve all the problems,
probably not even in principle. What we might be able to
foresee, and this is something we couldn't have done 20
years ago, is what many of the main problems are. Your own
lists above and in your previous posting are a good starting
point for that.

Of course a hundred or a thousand years from now, just an
evolutionary blink of the eye, our descendents may have it all
down pat.

Alan

Re: Species Resurrection