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COMMENT: referee # II

The authors have performed a useful task in carefully analyzing the serological
cross-reactions of a large number of type 1 polioviruses, but I cannot agree with their
interpretation of the results. In my opinion their data show no antigenic differences among
the strains that were tested. The slight differences that were found are not uncommon
when the same serum and the same strain are tested on different occasions. Furthermore,
the strains may vary in the number of antibody-combining particles per infective dose,
which in addition to other factors such as avidity, may yield different titers without
reference to inherent antigenic constitution.

On page 15 it is stated: "One strain, namely Chieti, was consistently found to
differ from the other type 1 viruses". Accordingly I constructed the following table from
the data in Tables 10, 11 and 12 and could find no confirmation for the authors' statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIRUS</th>
<th>CHIETI</th>
<th>FM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monkey CPE</td>
<td>Monkey MIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIETI</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>3260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>3585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data contained in this communication should be on record, but I do not favor
publication of a paper in which the conclusions are not supported by the data.