

Simply to be more suppressive than the T-3 test is no advantage. We are aware of no reports that the T-3 test fails to suppress normal patients. Of value might be a suppression test that, while retaining the selective suppressive effects of T-3, does the job more rapidly (and where T-3 might prove hazardous, more safely). It is an advantage (not a disadvantage) that T-3 produces its suppressive effects specifically via the feedback mechanism controlling T.S.H. release. It is the integrity of the feedback mechanism that we wish to test. It is the additional effects of KI directly on the thyroid and the stable iodine pool size which permit it to suppress uptake in hyperthyroids.

Again we appreciate the opportunity to share Dr. Spring's experience. We look forward with anticipation to reading more about his work with the KI test.

VERY TRULY YOURS,
JOEL I. HAMBURGER, M.D.

TO THE EDITOR:

Page xvi of this journal's November, 1964 issue prints a *Special Announcement*. Its intentions are somewhat fuzzy, but since the New Era is to start "with this issue" (November) we may take it that Dr. Sears' review, three pages later, gives us a taste of the kind of punishment that the Journal plans to dish out to the rest of us, as it did to Dr. Sears.

If this is the new policy it is a mistake. The needs of a physicist, spelling out a nuclear reaction, are quite different from those of an author who is composing an English sentence. In the latter case there is no necessity for extensive disclosure of nuclear information in condensed form, and the only requirement is to identify the nuclide clearly and with minimum inconvenience. In the interests of clarity you should tell the reader the most important thing first: namely which element you are talking about. Until he knows this, the mass number tells him nothing.

For years most of us have been delivering this information sensibly, and without harassment from superscripts that are a curse to typist, printer, reader and proof-reader alike. Why in the world should we abandon a rational and practical code that puts first things first? Have we become a herd of jelly-bellied me-too-ists, too timid to stand up and think for ourselves? I suggest that to drag nuclear-reaction shorthand out of its appointed place, and plant it in the middle of a sentence, is a clumsy and thoughtless blunder. Somebody—presumably a JNM editor—has made Dr. Sears say "14-Carbon" instead of "carbon-14". Somebody made him say "⁶⁰Co" and "¹³⁷Ce". Somebody wasn't thinking.

No doubt those responsible for this move thought they were keeping up with the times, streamlining the Journal, speeding jet-propelled into the New Atomic Era, or whatever cliché you like. The pitiful truth is precisely the contrary: they hadn't even learned to put the horse before the cart.

There is no need for any of us to pirouette into an anxiety attack if some faddist calls us "old hat". There is no need to hound a competent writer with demands that he keep up with the nucleochemical Joneses. There is no need to ram either domestic or foreign fancies down his throat if they can't be defended under the circumstances that apply. There is a need, however, in this journal as in others, for clear communication, and the threatened policy ignores it. It muddies the water instead of clearing it. It is not being modern, it is turning the clock back.

I have no objection at all to the abandonment of established habits, just so long as the urge to do so comes from the cortex and not the midbrain. I think we should join with the International Union of Applied Chemistry in using their code for those situations where it pays off—for example in nuclear reactions or nuclide-sensitive chemical formulae. But let us steer clear of it wherever it is a drug on the market and something better is already at hand. Within the field of English composition, therefore, I vote emphatically for "cobalt-57", "technetium-99m", and so on. Not "⁹⁹₄₃technetium^m", no matter who may think it's jet-age. If we feel the urge to abbreviate, "Co-57" and "Tc-99m" will serve very nicely. You gain

nothing by insisting that the mass number be put up in the air—unless your basic motive is to exasperate the stenographer. And, we have been fairly warned, “Hell hath no fury . . . ”

When we write for a journal our primary business is to communicate ideas, and I move that we attend to business. If some exalted god of literary etiquette needs to have his feet kissed, I vote we leave that to someone else.

D. A. ROSS
OAK RIDGE

Jan. 13, 1965

BOOK REVIEW

J. F. HOLT, W. M. WHITEHOUSE, AND H. B. LATOURETTE: *1964-65 Year Book of Radiology* (Year Book Medical Publishers, Inc., Chicago, 1964-65; price \$12.00).

The major portion of the abstracts in the *1964-65 Year Book of Radiology* are concerned with diagnostic and therapeutic radiology. Chapters on radiobiology, treatment planning techniques and physics, radioisotopes and radiation therapy, and radiation control and hazards, though limited in scope, will be of interest to those engaged in the field of nuclear medicine.

G.E.T.

BOOKS RECEIVED

MEDICAL RADIOISOTOPE SCANNING, Vol. I, *National Agency for International Publications, Inc.*, 317 East 34 Street, New York, New York 10016, Publication date: February 5, 1965; Price: \$11.50.

MEDICAL RADIOISOTOPE SCANNING, Vol. II, *National Agency for International Publications, Inc.*, 317 East 34 Street, New York, New York 10016, Publication date: December, 1964; Price: \$9.50.

SCINTILLATION SCANNING IN CLINICAL MEDICINE, Based on a Symposium Sponsored by the Department of Radiology of the Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Editor: James L. Quinn, III, M.D.; *W. B. Saunders Company*, Philadelphia; Publication date: October 19, 1964; Price: \$11.50.

ASSESSMENT OF RADIOACTIVITY IN MAN, Vol. 1, *National Agency for International Publications, Inc.*, 317 East 34 Street, New York, New York 10016, Publication date: April 5, 1965; Price: \$8.00.

ASSESSMENT OF RADIOACTIVITY IN MAN, Vol. 2, *National Agency for International Publications, Inc.*, 317 East 34 Street, New York, New York 10016, Publication date: April 5, 1965; Price: \$13.00.

INTERNATIONAL DIRECTORY OF ISOTOPES, *National Agency for International Publications, Inc.*, 317 East 34 Street, New York, New York 10016, Publication date: February 1, 1965; Price: \$9.00.