



Manuscript to be returned to

October 26, 1957.

Dear Boris:

I have just now managed to get to your ms. (amidst preparations for leaving Melbourne and other responsibilities) and am about to send it directly to J. Bact. with some minor corrections on my part. I hope you will have an opportunity to make any necessary revisions after the reviewers have criticized it. In particular, the ~~argument~~ derivation of p.14 Para. 1 is a bit mysterious and should be clarified. The statement of the two 'enzyme-like systems' of p. 20, Para. 2 could also be clarified something like the following:

(begin with sentence 2): One would govern the entry of specific substrates into the cell; the second would accumulate the entered material to high concentrations. The permeation system would be specifically induced, but would not require appreciable energy for its function. etc. The accumulation system, though requiring energy, need not be inducible ~~for~~ or highly specific etc.

This is not the clearest way your thought can be cast--- in any case, I was not so sure of your thinking on this critical issue to want to take responsibility for restating it.

I also, for the moment, deleted the next to last paragr. on p. 20 as I did not understand it. I also thought it uncrisp to allude so vaguely to the experiments which "were not encouraging". If you restore this Paragr., I suggest you be somewhat more specific.

P. 14— "(Lederberg, private communication)" : I would add "cf. Cohn & Monod..." or ~~xxx~~ whatever the reference is to their listing of these compounds— we don't have to emulate their own ungraciousness/ on this particular issue. If I can find the reference myself (which is not too likely at short notice here) I'll put it in myself.

P. 15 last Para. This is a rather disorganized statement of a lot of important information. It would almost warrant a separate subheading: interactions of cations and diverse substrates, and a systematic list. In re effect of distilled water, did say NaCl restore activity? I would think the emphasis should be on the cation, not the maleic or phosphate.

P.16 I would recommend leaving out Paragr. 4 but have left it in for the present.

This is all for the moment. If all goes well, you should have the ms. back for revision in a month or so. If you would like to return it via Madison, I'll be glad to look at it again, but as both you and the Journal may be in a hurry, you could send it directly back to Porter. I have also suggested that



he send you the proofs direct. If this is impractical I will be glad to read them. (I will be in Madison by Thanksgiving).

Please let Hank and me know of your intentions with regard to reprints. I assume a fair number would be purchased by the UW but let us know. ~~University of Melbourne~~ Santiago, etc.

We will be en route to India by the time you get this. If anything urgent came up, you might contact us ~~at the University of Melbourne~~ in Milan, but we'll be home not too long after.

VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA

With best regards,

Yours,

Joshua Lederberg