

*Letter to the Editor***The “human” statistics of terrestrial impact cratering rate\***

L. Jetsu

NORDITA, Blegdamsvej 17, Copenhagen 2100, Denmark

Received 17 January 1997 / Accepted 11 March 1997

**Abstract.** The most significant periodicities in the terrestrial impact crater record are due to the “human–signal”: the bias of assigning integer values for the crater ages. This bias seems to have eluded the proponents and opponents of real periodicity in the occurrence of these events, as well as the theorists searching for an extraterrestrial explanation for such periodicity. The “human–signal” should be seriously considered by scientists in astronomy, geology and paleontology when searching for a connection between terrestrial major comet or asteroid impacts and mass extinctions of species.

**Key words:** Solar system: Earth – Comets, Techniques: statistical, Galaxy: solar neighbourhood

**1. Introduction**

An outstanding series of papers appeared in 1984 when a 28.4 Myr cycle was detected in the terrestrial impact crater record (Alvarez & Muller 1984, Davis et al. 1984, Whitmire & Jackson 1984). This value was close to the 26 Myr cycle discovered in the geological record of major mass extinctions of species (Raup & Sepkoski 1984). The fascinating idea of periodic comet impacts causing ecological catastrophies emerged (Alvarez & Muller 1984, Davis et al. 1984). It was suggested that an unseen solar companion (Nemesis) might induce gravitational disturbances to the Oort comet cloud triggering periodic cometary showers (Davis et al. 1984, Whitmire & Jackson 1984). Other astronomical models have been proposed later to account for the above periodicities, the “galactic carousel” being perhaps the most widely accepted model (e.g. the review by Rampino & Haggerty 1996, and references). The main idea of the “galactic carousel” model is that the Oort comet cloud is periodically perturbed by galactic tides as the Solar System revolves around the centre of the Milky Way galaxy.

We will show that only one extremely significant regularity exists in the impact crater record: the “human–signal”.

Send offprint requests to: L. Jetsu (jetsu@nordita.dk)

\* Table 1 is only available in electronic form: see A&A 266, E1

**2. Data**

We chose  $n = 82$  impact craters with a diameter  $D_i$  [km] and an age  $t_i$  [Myr], which had an error ( $\sigma_{t_i}$ ) in the database maintained by the Geological Survey of Canada.<sup>1</sup> These data are *only* published in electronic form in our Table 1. Eight simultaneous events were combined ( $\Rightarrow n = 74$ ) with the relations  $\sigma_{1,2} = \min[\sigma_{t_1}, \sigma_{t_2}]/\sqrt{2}$  and  $D_{1,2} = (D_1^2 + D_2^2)^{1/2}$ , where  $\sigma_{t_1}$ ,  $\sigma_{t_2}$ ,  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  refer to the individual events. The geographical coordinates of these pairs imply an occurrence of a double impact, except for one pair ( $i = 37$ ). Combining probable double impacts leaves our result unchanged, but provides better statistics. Six subsamples were selected from Table 1 ( $n = 74$ ):

$C_1: 5 \leq t$

$C_2: t \leq 250, \sigma_t \leq 20, D \geq 5$

$C_3: 5 \leq t \leq 300, \sigma_t \leq 20$

$C_4: C_1, t$  is not a multiple of 5

$C_5: C_2, t$  is not a multiple of 5

$C_6: C_3, t$  is not a multiple of 5

Criteria similar to  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  have been applied earlier (Grieve & Pesonen 1996, Matsumoto & Kubotani 1996). We also analysed the sample ( $C_7: n = 11$ ), where the 28.4 Myr cycle was originally detected (Alvarez & Muller 1984), and one sample of mass extinctions of species ( $C_8: n = 8$ ), recently compared to the impact crater record (Matsumoto & Kubotani 1996). Two sets of weights were derived:


$w_{t_i} = A_t \sigma_{t_i}^{-2}$  and  $w_{D,i} = A_D D_i$ ,

where  $A_t = n/[\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_{t_i}^{-2}]$  and  $A_D = n/[\sum_{i=1}^n D_i]$  ensure that  $\sum_{i=1}^n w_{t_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n w_{D,i} = n$ . The two largest ( $w_{\max,1}$ ,  $w_{\max,2}$ ) and the smallest ( $w_{\min}$ ) weights, the ratio  $W_R = w_{\max,1}/w_{\min}$  and the average  $s = (w_{\max,1} + w_{\max,2})/2$  for  $C_1, \dots, C_7$  are given in Table 2 (No  $\sigma_{t_i}$  were available for  $C_8$ ).

**3. Analysis**

Two types of techniques have been mainly applied to search for periodicity in the impact crater record: the power spectrum method and those discussed by Yabushita (1991). The 28.4 Myr cycle was detected with the former technique (Alvarez & Muller

<sup>1</sup> //gdcinfo.agg.emr.ca/cb-bin/crater/crater\_table?e



**Fig. 1.** The ten best period candidates detected with the K-method for  $C_1$  with  $n = 61$ : the overfilling factor (Jetsu & Pelt 1996: Eq. 12) is  $[\Delta\phi]^{-1} = GM = 10$  for this test between  $P_{\min} = 2.2$  and  $P_{\max} = 200$ . The statistics for  $m = 904$  independent frequencies yield the level  $P(V_n \geq z_0) = \gamma = 0.001$  outlined with a horizontal line. The numbers above the short vertical lines denote the locations of  $P_1^{-1}, \dots, P_{10}^{-1}$ .

**Fig. 2.** The ten best period candidates detected with the WSD-method for  $C_6(w_D)$  with  $n = 23$ : the level  $P(V_{\beta_n} \leq C_n/\beta_n) = \gamma = 0.001$  for  $m = 108$  is outlined with a horizontal line ( $P_{\min}, P_{\max}, G$  and  $M$  as in Fig. 1).

**Table 2.** The weights  $w_t$  and  $w_D$  of  $C_1, \dots, C_7$ : the two largest ( $w_{\max,1}, w_{\max,2}$ ) and the smallest ( $w_{\min}$ ) weights, the ratio  $W_R = w_{\max,1}/w_{\min}$ , the average  $s = (w_{\max,1} + w_{\max,2})/2$ , and the breakdown parameter  $R(s)$  (Jetsu 1996: Eq. 5).

$w$	$n$	$w_{\min}$	$w_{\max,1}$	$w_{\max,2}$	$W_R$	$s$	$R(s)$
$C_1(w_t)$	61	$3.15 \cdot 10^{-6}$	50.41	6.43	$1.60 \cdot 10^7$	28.42	3.57
$C_1(w_D)$	61	$4.44 \cdot 10^{-2}$	8.32	6.93	187.50	7.63	0.10
$C_2(w_t)$	34	$2.75 \cdot 10^{-5}$	27.54	4.41	$1.00 \cdot 10^6$	15.97	4.21
$C_2(w_D)$	34	0.15	4.66	2.74	30.91	3.70	0.10
$C_3(w_t)$	35	$1.81 \cdot 10^{-4}$	29.00	3.70	$1.60 \cdot 10^5$	16.35	3.94
$C_3(w_D)$	35	$6.99 \cdot 10^{-2}$	4.75	2.80	68.00	3.77	0.10
$C_4(w_t)$	27	$1.16 \cdot 10^{-4}$	22.44	2.86	$1.94 \cdot 10^5$	12.65	4.14
$C_4(w_D)$	27	$6.47 \cdot 10^{-2}$	6.26	3.55	96.77	4.91	0.23
$C_5(w_t)$	25	$2.03 \cdot 10^{-5}$	20.26	3.24	$1.00 \cdot 10^6$	11.75	4.30
$C_5(w_D)$	25	0.15	4.66	2.74	30.91	3.70	0.17
$C_6(w_t)$	23	$1.20 \cdot 10^{-4}$	19.15	2.44	$1.60 \cdot 10^5$	10.80	4.23
$C_6(w_D)$	23	$8.17 \cdot 10^{-2}$	4.48	2.63	54.84	3.56	0.19
$C_7(w_t)$	11	$1.11 \cdot 10^{-2}$	9.04	0.49	816.33	4.77	2.44
$C_7(w_D)$	11	0.36	2.57	2.06	7.14	2.31	0.36

1984). Techniques of the latter type have been applied, e.g. by Yabushita (1991) and Grieve & Pesonen (1996). Yet it has not been fully realized that these techniques are most sensitive to uni-modal phase distributions. These phases are *circular* data: a random sample of measurements representing  $\phi_i$  at  $t_i$  folded with a period  $P$  (i.e.  $\phi_i = \text{FIX}[t_i/P]$ , where FIX removes the integer part of  $t_i/P$ ). Several nonparametric methods for detecting both uni- and multi-modal  $\phi_i$  distributions exist. We applied two such methods by Kuiper (1960: the K-method) and Swanepoel & De Beer (1990: the SD-method), and their weighted versions (Jetsu & Pelt 1996: the WK- and the WSD-methods), which can utilize the additional information in  $w_t$  and  $w_D$ . Our notations are as in Jetsu & Pelt (1996).

The limit  $t \geq 5$  eliminates a bias ( $C_1, C_3, C_4$  and  $C_6$ ), because over 17 % of  $t_i$  in Table 1 are below this limit, e.g. these  $t_i$  have  $\phi_i \leq 0.05$  for  $P \geq 100$ . A limit in  $t$  is unnecessary for  $C_2$  and  $C_5$ , since the criteria in  $\sigma_t$  and  $D$  eliminate most of the  $t_i \leq 5$ . The criterion in  $D$  was applied, because earlier studies have indicated

different periodicities for  $t_i$  of larger and smaller craters (e.g. Yabushita 1991).

The statistical “null hypothesis”:

$H_0$ : “The  $\phi_i$  of  $t_i$  with an arbitrary period  $P$  are randomly distributed between 0 and 1.”

was tested between  $P_{\min} = 2.2$  and  $P_{\max} = 200$ . The preassigned significance level for rejecting  $H_0$  was  $\gamma = 0.001$ . Two examples of these tests are displayed in Figs. 1 and 2. Most of the detected  $P$  reaching  $\gamma = 0.001$  are integers or ratios of two integers (see Table 3). We call this regularity arising from the bias of assigning integer values for  $t_i$  as the “human-signal”. Unfortunately, any arbitrary  $P$  can be expressed by a ratio of two integers. Two  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  of the “human-signal” will induce a set of spurious periods  $P' = [P_1^{-1} + k_1(k_2 P_2)^{-1}]^{-1}$  ( $k_1 = \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$  and  $k_2 = 1, 2, \dots$ ). Furthermore, another set of spurious periods will be  $P' = k_3 P_1 P_2$  ( $k_3 = 1, 2, \dots$ ). The “human-signal” is strongest in  $C_1$ , since many larger  $t_i$  end with 5 or 0, hence  $C_4, C_5$  and  $C_6$  were selected. Although removing multiples of 5 should eliminate the strongest component of the “human-signal”, integer  $P$  are still present in  $C_4, C_5$  and  $C_6$ , the largest being  $P = 30$  ( $Q_{WK} = 0.0016$ ) in  $C_4$ . An arbitrary  $P_{\min} = 2.2$  was chosen to avoid the detection of, e.g.  $P = 2, 3/2$ , and 1. Note that the order of significance for the period candidates in Figs. 1 and 2 is not necessarily the same as in Table 3, since these periodograms were derived for the overfilling factor  $[\Delta\phi]^{-1} = GM = 10$  (Jetsu & Pelt 1996: Eq. 12). The final values of Table 3 in the vicinity of these period candidates were determined with  $[\Delta\phi]^{-1} = 100$ . These four methods are not “equally sensitive” to different  $\phi_i$  distributions (Jetsu 1996, Jetsu & Pelt 1996), which explains the differences in the detected  $P$ .

Although uncertainties in some critical level estimates  $Q_K, Q_{WK}, Q_{SD}$  and  $Q_{WSD}$  exist, these do not alter the *order* of significance for the detected  $P$  (Jetsu & Pelt 1996). Thus the “human-signal” is the most significant periodicity in the data. Firstly, the estimate for the number of independent frequencies in all tests was  $m = (f_{\max} - f_{\min})/f_0$ , where  $f_{\max} = P_{\min}^{-1}$ ,  $f_{\min} = P_{\max}^{-1}$  and

**Table 3.** The five best periods detected in  $C_1, \dots, C_8$  with the K–, WK–, SD– and WSD–methods: The estimate of the number of independent frequencies is  $m$  for a sample of a size  $n$ . The symbols ‡ and † denote the cases  $m > m'$  and  $m < m'$ . The critical levels for each period  $P$  are  $Q_K$ ,  $Q_{WK}$ ,  $Q_{SD}$  and  $Q_{WSD}$ . The rejection of  $H_0$  with  $\gamma=0.001$  is indicated by •. Finally, the cases when an application of some particular method would not yield reliable results are denoted by \*

	K–method no weights $P(Q_K)$	WK–method $w_D$ $P(Q_{WK})$	SD–method no weights $P(Q_{SD})$	WSD–method $w_D$ $P(Q_{WSD})$
$c_1$ $n = 61$ $m = 904$	2.50 ( $\sim 0\ddagger$ ) • 5.00 ( $2.0 \cdot 10^{-13}\ddagger$ ) • 3.00 ( $3.9 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) • 10.00 ( $2.1 \cdot 10^{-4}\ddagger$ ) • 3.33 ( $2.1 \cdot 10^{-4}\ddagger$ ) •	2.50 ( $\sim 0\ddagger$ ) • 3.00 ( $1.0 \cdot 10^{-13}\ddagger$ ) • 5.00 ( $1.2 \cdot 10^{-8}\ddagger$ ) • 15.00 ( $5.0 \cdot 10^{-8}\ddagger$ ) • 9.97 ( $4.1 \cdot 10^{-7}\ddagger$ ) •	20.00 ( $0\ddagger$ ) • 2.66... ( $0\ddagger$ ) • 5.00 ( $0\ddagger$ ) • 8.00 ( $0\ddagger$ ) • 2.50 ( $0\ddagger$ ) •	2.22... ( $0\ddagger$ ) • 5.00 ( $0\ddagger$ ) • 2.66... ( $0\ddagger$ ) • 4.00 ( $0\ddagger$ ) • 20.00 ( $0\ddagger$ ) •
$c_2$ $n = 34$ $m = 110$	3.00 (0.0078) 2.50 (0.11) 11.67 (0.58) 17.50 (0.62) 7.00 (0.73)	2.50 ( $2.6 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 7.76 ( $6.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ ) • 3.00 ( $7.4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ ) • 9.95 (0.0037) 12.56 (0.0046)	5.00 ( $8.9 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 2.50 ( $8.9 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 3.00 ( $1.6 \cdot 10^{-9}$ ) • 2.25 ( $4.0 \cdot 10^{-9}$ ) • 6.00 ( $5.0 \cdot 10^{-9}$ ) •	5.00 ( $8.9 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 2.50 ( $8.9 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 3.00 ( $1.9 \cdot 10^{-9}$ ) • 6.00 ( $6.7 \cdot 10^{-9}$ ) • 4.00 ( $7.3 \cdot 10^{-9}$ ) •
$c_3$ $n = 35$ $m = 127$	2.50 (0.0023) 3.00 (0.0053) 5.00 (0.18) 2.86 (0.58) 11.62 (0.80)	2.50 ( $1.4 \cdot 10^{-6}$ ) • 3.00 ( $1.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ ) • 7.76 ( $1.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ ) • 12.56 (0.0016) 9.95 (0.0038)	5.00 ( $4.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 2.66... ( $4.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 2.50 ( $4.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 4.00 ( $4.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 10.00 ( $4.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) •	2.50 ( $4.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 8.00 ( $4.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 5.00 ( $4.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 4.00 ( $4.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) • 2.66.. ( $4.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ) •
$c_4$ $n = 27$ $m = 904$	2.50 (0.33‡) 13.20 (0.83‡) 3.00 (0.88‡) 2.98 (0.96‡) 5.50 (0.97‡)	2.50 ( $2.3 \cdot 10^{-4}\ddagger$ ) • 2.98 ( $5.3 \cdot 10^{-4}\ddagger$ ) • 2.70 ( $6.3 \cdot 10^{-4}\ddagger$ ) • 7.77 ( $7.1 \cdot 10^{-4}\ddagger$ ) • 30.00 (0.0016†)	4.00 ( $3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) • 2.50 ( $3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) • 5.00 ( $3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) • 10.00 ( $3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) • 3.33... ( $3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) •	4.00 ( $3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) • 2.50 ( $3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) • 5.00 ( $3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) • 10.00 ( $3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) • 3.33... ( $3.1 \cdot 10^{-6}\ddagger$ ) •
$c_5$ $n = 25$ $m = 110$	2.50 (0.17) 17.43 (0.31) 7.50 (0.49) 3.00 (0.49) 14.12 (0.52)	7.77 (0.0011) 2.98 (0.0011) 3.71 (0.0033) 7.11 (0.017) 2.67 (0.021)	2.50 ( $2.0 \cdot 10^{-6}$ ) • 5.00 ( $2.0 \cdot 10^{-6}$ ) • 3.00 ( $3.7 \cdot 10^{-6}$ ) • 3.50 ( $1.0 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 4.00 ( $1.7 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) •	2.50 ( $2.0 \cdot 10^{-6}$ ) • 5.00 ( $2.0 \cdot 10^{-6}$ ) • 3.00 ( $4.9 \cdot 10^{-6}$ ) • 3.50 ( $1.3 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 4.00 ( $3.4 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) •
$c_6$ $n = 23$ $m = 108$	14.00 (0.50) 7.00 (0.56) 3.00 (0.61) 3.87 (0.69) 2.50 (0.75)	2.98 ( $5.7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ ) • 7.77 (0.0013) 3.71 (0.0018) 13.54 (0.012) 2.52 (0.013)	5.00 ( $1.0 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 2.50 ( $1.0 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 3.00 ( $1.4 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 7.00 ( $1.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 3.50 ( $2.2 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) •	5.00 ( $1.0 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 2.50 ( $1.0 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 3.00 ( $1.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 3.50 ( $2.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) • 3.75 ( $3.8 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) •
$c_7$ $n = 11$ $m = 87$	3.82 (0.042) 2.95 (0.044) 2.30 (0.059) 7.64 (0.062) 28.75 (0.067)	* * * * *	4.00 (0) • 10.00 (0) • * * *	* * * * *
$c_8$ $n = 8$ $m = 105$	2.76 (0.0031) 3.68 (0.064) 3.22 (0.13) 11.03 (0.31) 13.80 (0.39)	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *

$f_0 = (t_{\max} - t_{\min})^{-1}$ . These  $m$  estimates were checked with the empirical correlation function  $r(k)$  (Jetsu & Pelt 1996: Eq. 14). We denote the number of independent frequencies implied by  $r(k)$  with  $m'$ . Some tests had  $m' \neq m$ . The correct values for the critical level are smaller when  $m > m'$  (i.e. the significance is higher), while the case is opposite for  $m < m'$ . This problem is only present in  $C_1$  and  $C_4$  containing less older than younger craters, and thus the inverse of  $t_{\max} - t_{\min}$  provides a poor  $f_0$  estimate. Secondly,  $Q_K \geq Q_{WK}$  when the same period is detected with the K– and WK–methods (Jetsu & Pelt 1996: Eq. 30), which is due to the large scatter in  $w_D$  (see Table 2). For example, the sum of the two largest  $w_D$  in  $C_1$  ( $n=61$ ) is 15.25, which disrupts the statistics of the WK–method. However, the values of  $Q_K$  are reliable when  $m = m'$ . Thirdly, the statistics of the WSD–method are quite robust even for a higher scatter of weights. But the values of  $Q_{SD}$  and  $Q_{WSD}$  are uncertain for smaller samples, since the analytical estimate for the critical parameter  $C_n$  is accurate only for larger samples (Jetsu & Pelt 1996: Eq. 16). The SD–method reveals some bizarre cases

( $Q_{SD} = 0 \equiv$  never), e.g. for  $C_7$  with  $P = 4$  or 10. No random sample can contain so many time differences that are multiples of 4 or 10. The power spectrum in Alvarez & Muller (1984: Fig. 2) showed no signs of  $P = 4$  or 10, and thus it was logical to assume that integer  $t_i$  did not induce the 28.4Myr cycle. Even if  $C_7$  contained a period that is apparently not due to the “human–signal”, such as 28.4Myr, it is impossible to decide whether this period is a multiple of, say  $7 \times 4$ . In fact,  $P=28.75$  ( $Q_K = 0.067$ ) is the fifth most significant period detected with the K–method in  $C_7$ .

Table 2 shows, why no results for  $w_t$  were obtained. The largest  $w_t$  are typically  $\gtrsim n/2$ , and thus the statistics of the WK–method would be unreliable. As for the WSD–method, we refer to the breakdown parameter  $R(s)$  in Table 2. If  $R(s)$  exceeds unity, the statistics of the WSD–method are disrupted (Jetsu 1996: Eq. 5). Table 2 indicates that the WK– and WSD–methods must not be applied with  $w_t$ . Because the high scatter in  $w_t$  prevents applications of the WK– and WSD–methods, we checked, if the removal of less accurate  $t_i$  would significantly

alter  $w_{\max,1}$  or  $R(s)$  for  $w_t$ . But this removal of less accurate  $t_i$  did not yield  $R(s) < 1$  for  $w_t$  even if this procedure was carried out until only 5 values remained in  $C_1, \dots, C_7$ . The same applies to  $w_{\max,1}$ , which remains too close to  $n$ .

Why was the “human–signal” not detected earlier, while the 28.4 Myr cycle was detected? The answer to the first question is that the  $\phi_i$  distributions connected to the “human–signal” are mostly multi–modal, and can not be detected with methods sensitive to uni–modal  $\phi_i$  distributions. There are several answers to the second question. The 28.4 Myr cycle, as well as any other noninteger period, may be induced by the “human–signal”. For example, one earlier study revealed mainly multiples of 5 (Yabushita 1991: e.g.  $30 \times 1 = 15 \times 2 = 10 \times 3 = 6 \times 5$ ). Since  $C_7$  has  $Q_{SD} = 0$  for  $P = 4$  or 10, no Monte Carlo simulation will ever “succeed” in producing so many exactly equal time differences, let alone the two additional equal  $t$  values in  $C_7$ . The analysis by Alvarez & Muller (1984) is repeated in Jetsu & Pelt (1997: Paper II), where the influences of the “human–signal” on Monte Carlo significance estimates is studied in detail. Finally, the scatter of  $w_t$  in  $C_7$  is so large that the case  $n=11$  does not occur, because the sum of the two largest  $w_t$  is 9.5. An analysis of the superimposed gaussians of these  $t_i$  detects periods from the highest peaks with large  $w_t$ , while the smaller  $w_t$  do not influence the result (e.g.  $w_{\min} = 0.01$ ).

The small sample  $C_8$  could only be reliably analysed with the K–method. No signs of the 26 Myr cycle were detected (Raup & Sepkoski 1984, 1986), nor any period with  $Q_K \leq \gamma = 0.001$ . The best periods do not betray any trivial signature of the “human–signal”, although half of the  $t_i$  are integers. If the most significant  $P = 2.76$  ( $Q_K = 0.0031$ ) represents real periodicity, Raup & Sepkoski (1984, 1986) have identified about every tenth mass extinction event.

#### 4. Conclusions

A few topics must be emphasized to avoid misunderstanding. (I) We did not assume that the integer  $t_i$  cause the detected periodicities. On the contrary, the periodicities were uniquely detected with non–parametric statistical methods (i.e. model independent). We simply tested the “null hypothesis” ( $H_0$ ) that the impact crater ages represent a random sample of circular data. The “human–signal” reaches  $\gamma = 0.001$  in all subsamples  $C_1, \dots, C_7$ , the critical levels of the SD– and WSD–methods being extremely high. The analytical statistics of our methods are robust, i.e. Monte Carlo or other computational techniques are unnecessary. (II) The “human–signal” induces irregular multi–modal  $\phi_i$  distributions, which were not detected earlier with methods sensitive to uni–modal  $\phi_i$  distributions. For example, the power spectrum method is most sensitive to sinusoidal variations. If the  $\phi_i$  distribution for the “correct”  $P'$  were exactly bi–modal, the peaks of the power spectrum would be at  $P', P'/2, \dots$ . But the power spectrum method is quite insensitive to more irregular  $\phi_i$  distributions. That the “human–signal” was not detected earlier, over twelve years after the study by Alvarez & Muller (1984), is a direct consequence of favouring methods sensitive to uni–modal  $\phi_i$  distributions. Except for the Nemesis and “galactic

carrousel” models, why should the  $\phi_i$  distributions connected to the possible periodicity in terrestrial impact cratering rate or mass extinctions of species actually be uni–modal or of any regular shape? (III) It may well be that the large  $\sigma_{t_i}$  prevent detection of periodicity (e.g. Heisler & Tremaine 1989). In that case our study is simply an exercise of statistics providing one new argument against real periodicity. However, considering the prevailing theories based on assuming the presence of real periodicities (see e.g. Rampino & Haggerty 1996: “Shiva Hypothesis”), it was a high time to perform this exercise. (IV) The “human–signal” has most probably induced those spurious periods with more or less unimodal  $\phi_i$  distributions, which were detected in several earlier studies (e.g. Alvarez & Muller 1984, Yabushita 1991). In any case, the “human–signal” is clearly the most significant periodicity in the impact crater record. (V) We do not argue that the major comet or asteroid impacts and the mass extinctions of species are uncorrelated, but emphasize that the “human–signal” dominates the time distribution of the former events. (VI) The influences of the “human–signal” on statistics is examined in greater detail in Paper II.

Our conclusions are simple. The epochs of mass extinction events of species may follow a possibly “nonhuman” cycle of 2.76 Myr, but the currently available impact crater data definitely reveals the embarrassing “human–signal”. The fellow scientists have unconsciously offered a helping hand to the Nemesis (e.g. Davis et al. 1984) or “galactic carrousel” (e.g. Rampino & Haggerty 1996). The arduous task for the future geological research is to determine more accurate (preferably noninteger) revised ages for impact craters to eliminate the “human–signal”, which may then lead to a detection of real periodicity. Over a decade has elapsed in redetecting the regularities of our own integer number system and then interpreting them as periodicity in the ages of impact craters.

*Acknowledgements.* This work was partly supported by the EC Human Capital and Mobility (Networks) project “Late type stars: activity, magnetism, turbulence” No. ERBCHRXCT940483. We wish to thank Prof. R.A. Muller and an anonymous referee for valuable comments on the manuscript.

#### References

- Alvarez W., Muller R.A. 1984, Nat 308, 718
- Davis M., Hut P., Muller R.A. 1984, Nat 308, 715
- Grewing M., Lequeux J., Pottasch S.R. 1992, A&A 266, E1–E2
- Grieve R.A.F., Pesonen L.J. 1996, Earth, Moon and Planets 72, 357
- Heisler J., Tremaine S. 1989, Icarus 77, 213
- Jetsu L., Pelt J. 1996, A&AS 118, 587
- Jetsu L. 1996, A&A 314, 153
- Jetsu L., Pelt J., Geophys. Res. Lett., submitted (Paper II)
- Kuiper N.H. 1960, Proc. Koninkl. Nederl. Akad. Van Wetenschappen, Series A, 63, 38
- Matsumoto M., Kubotani H. 1996, MNRAS 282, 1407
- Rampino M.R., Haggerty B.M. 1996, Earth, Moon and Planets 72, 441
- Raup D.M., Sepkoski J.J. 1984, Proc. natn. Acad. Sci. USA 81, 801
- Raup D.M., Sepkoski J.J. 1986, Sci 231, 833
- Swanepoel J.W.H., De Beer C.F. 1990, ApJ 350, 754
- Whitmire D.P., Jackson A.A. 1984, Nat 308, 713
- Yabushita S. 1991, MNRAS 250, 481