

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON



POSTGRADUATE MEDICAL SCHOOL
OF LONDON

Telegrams
POSGRADMED CHISK LONDON
Telephone
SHEphard's Bush 1260 (4 lines)

DUCANE ROAD
LONDON, W.12

27. 11. 52.

My dear Luca,

I have got both your letters & have sent you a reassuring telegram! I rang up Standfest last Friday & he said he didn't mind if your proofs were a week late & that a reasonable amount of alteration was alright, but he didn't like people wanting to rewrite their papers completely at the page-proof stage! He is a very reasonable chap & is well described by his name - nothing would rattle him, I imagine. All your alterations have gone in, including your preferred edition of the last para. & Joshua's "ineffective factor"! I presume you have retained your proof. On p. 92, l. 28, I have taken the liberty of slightly changing your amendment to "certain inhibitors (arsenite, citrate etc) of myxomas which might possibly destroy the F+ agent.....". I had already done this when your letter arrived. Did you notice a complete line had been left out at the bottom of p. 96? I have made the following alterations to Table 2. (1) In the caption "F-state" & column headings "F-condition of parents", it reads as F- (F minus) state etc. I have therefore deleted the "-" to avoid ambiguity; (2) I have indicated a double spacing between the lines following "TLB₁+ parent" & "TLB₁+S^r recombinants" & suggested bracketing everything below this & covering "TLB₁+S^r recombinants" to the middle of the brackets, thus:

In proof.
 TLB₁-S^r parent - - - - - etc.
 TLB₁+ parent + + + + + etc.
 TLB₁+ recombinants - - - - -
 - - - - - +
 - - - - - +

 + + + + +

Corrected proof.
 TLB₁-S^r parent - - - - -
 TLB₁+ parent + + + + +
 TLB₁+S^r recombinants { - - - - -
 - - - - - +
 - - - - - +

 + + + + +

P.T.O.

I hope you approve of this. It will, I think, be easier to read. Incidentally, your total for the last column of the 1st set should be 916 & not 816. You underestimate the amount of work you did! The editor will get another final page proof & contrary to practice, he will send this to me, so if you have anything else of a minor nature, let me know. I have written to the C.U.S., ordering 500 reprints for you & if they want immediate payment I will pay with pleasure & arrange with you later. I think that's all about the paper, except that I think it reads well & clearly. Oh! 3 important things I nearly forgot: ① on p. 94 of the proofs, 1/2 way down the page - "Moreover, crosses between an independent occurrence of 817-F-(8) & 168-F+ and other F+ auxotrophs were found to have a very low fertility, ----". In your original typescript I think you had "(8)". What does this indicate & what will I put in the final proof? Or will I delete the (8)? ② References for Davis, 1950, referring to ATCC 9637 please!

③ References for Cavalli, 1952 - on top of p. 97 please! There are blank in the "References".

One other thing - Lederberg's belief that ll. 21-29, p. 9 of his manuscript (which is the same as the one with the proofs) is too near the American version - I have read this account in both papers; I cannot see any great similarity in phraseology, apart from the facts themselves, so have left it as it stands. If the two versions are superficially alike it is simply because the same authors have been presenting the same facts in a concise way. There are certainly no grounds for criticism.

28th. I have just received your telegram. It is nice of you to want to thank me for doing the manuscript & proof corrections & I have added - "The authors wish to thank Dr. W. Hayes for his invaluable help in correcting the manuscript & proofs of this paper" - as per telegram. Thank you! Incidentally, I wouldn't dream of sending you a bill for the telegrams. The sum was very small. Sometimes you will stand me a drink! You must excuse me now as I have a lot of work to do. I will write again shortly about ~~the~~ experiments.

Expinitia

Yours -
Bill