To: Members of the "Panel for Picornaviruses" 

Dr. Henry Gelfand  
Dr. W. McD. Hammon  
Dr. Robert J. Huebner  
Dr. Albert Sabin 

Dr. Joseph L. Melnick  
Dr. Herbert A. Wenner  
Dr. Alfred N. Webb  
Dr. Robert Chanock

From: Leon Rosen

Subject: Report entitled "A DESCRIPTION OF RHINOVIRUSES".

I agree with Dr. Melnick that the report is a realistic appraisal of the current status of these agents. I also share his concern about the one log titer drop as the distinguishing feature between enteroviruses and rhinoviruses. Apparently, acid lability is not "all or none" and it would certainly not be surprising to see the one log criterion disappear with time. Of course, I realize that it is important to find some way of erecting the rhinovirus group as a monument to Sir Christopher.

I also have the following minor comments:

1. P. 1, l. 12. According to my reading of the paper by Johnson, et al., 1962, the viruses under discussion were not called "enterovirus-like viruses". They were called enteroviruses.

2. P. 1, l. 4; P. 3, l. 20; l. 22. I object to the use of the terms "colds" and "common colds" - especially when the expression "upper respiratory disease" (e.g. P. 4, l. 4) is used in the same report. Is there a difference in the meaning of these terms? I am not sure that everyone knows what a "cold" is. At least I don't and I have heard quite a few different definitions from others. Wouldn't it be possible to just use the expression "upper respiratory disease"? Is it also necessary to use the expression "common cold" as a monument to Sir Christopher?