April 11, 1957

Dr. John Sugg
Journal of Immunology
Cornell University Medical College
1300 York Avenue
New York 21, New York

Dear Dr. Sugg:

The enclosed manuscript was sent to me without the usual forms for editorial comment. Accordingly, you find them typed out on a separate sheet.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

Albert B. Sabin, M. D.

ABS: meh

encl.
"Biologic and Serologic Characteristics of Echo Viruses from West Virginia", by R. A. Ormsbee and J. L. Melnick

This report of certain properties of Echo viruses recovered from healthy children contains new information that deserves publication. Some mention of earlier studies on Echo viruses recovered from healthy children (Ramos-Alvarez and Sabin, Proc. Soc. Exp. Biol. and Med., 1954, 87, 655 and Am. J. Pub. Health, 1956, 46, 295) may perhaps be indicated as a means of correlating the expanding knowledge in this field, particularly since 16 of the 30 strains turned out to be serologically identical with the viruses first described by Ramos-Alvarez and Sabin in 1954. The poor antibody response to some of these strains reported in the present communication was also previously noted by the above authors (Am. J. Pub. Health, 1956, 46, 298).

The data shown in Table IV are interesting but the quantitative notations of "0" and "+" will not be very helpful to other investigators working with Echo viruses. It is suggested that the table either be deleted, if the contents are to become the subject of still another communication, or that the data be presented in more quantitative detail.

Table V is also not helpful as a qualitative "0" and "+" record and furthermore is not related to the subject under discussion. The data it presents on Echo types 1 to 14 is not new information since that is the way these viruses were established by the cooperating investigators of the committee on Echo viruses. The antigenic relationship among the Echo 1, 8 and 13 viruses has been the subject of cooperative studies by members of the Echo committee, and has no meaning when presented in the qualitative terms of "0" and "+". My recommendation, therefore, is that Table V be deleted and in its place the authors be requested to present in more detailed quantitative form the tests on Echo 15 only which emerged as a new prototype virus from this study.

The 10 figures are quite excellent but in my opinion can be deleted because:

1) The Echo types 1 and 2, and polio type 3 which are depicted are not among the viruses isolated and described in this study.

2) The changes depicted are not different from those already shown very beautifully in the publication of Reissig, Howes and Melnick for the polioviruses. The statement on page 8 of the present communication that the changes are "similar to those seen in cells infected with poliovirus" seems quite adequate.