

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

TO THE EDITOR:

As nearly as I can ascertain, the anonymous letter in the September 1964 issue of *J. Nuc. Med.* was directed as criticism of the article, "Channel Ratio in the Determination of Two Gamma-Emitting Radioisotopes" by Spencer and Seife (*J. Nuc. Med.* 5:562, 1964). Although not certain that this is true, and not certain of my qualifications as "an enlightened reader," I offer some comments.

It would appear that the authors received ". . . from the U. S. Government agencies special grants . . ." to support some research, presumed to be both advanced and worthy. It also appears that this simple determination was useful to them, quite incidental to the pursuit of a more sophisticated goal, not as an "advanced study" in itself. I also suspect that they, and the Editor and reviewers of our "esteemed Journal," felt this simple procedure would make life a bit easier for someone else in simultaneous counting of two-nuclide mixtures. These are good reasons for publishing the article. Moreover, it is customary, and generally *required*, to identify sources of grant support when publishing on *any* aspect of a study, even though it may be only incidental to work so supported. Thus a reasonable, and probably true, answer is given to our anonymous writer.

Concerning the article itself, I believe the criticism of Barney Watson (Letter to Editor, same issue) is valid. In addition, Francis *et al* (1) published in 1955 an example of simultaneous counting of an iodine-131–chromium-51 mixture. This is identical to the situation to the authors' equations 8 and 9, with $K = 1$ and $c = 0$, corrected for background, a most practical situation.

Even in trying to be harsh, the worst I can suggest is perhaps an unfamiliarity with the literature, or that it is an over-treatment of a simple situation, or that the "spectra" in Fig. 1 are not very realistic. Perhaps it may be said that the authors should have even included some examples.

Still, I must rise to the defense of the authors (whom I have criticized) and of the Journal. It is disappointing to see that the intentions, motivations, and objectives of the authors and the Editor have been so sadly misinterpreted. I feel that this situation demonstrates that the Journal's normal policy of refusing to publish anonymous letters is a good one.

C. CRAIG HARRIS
OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE

1. Francis, J. E., Bell, P. R., and Harris, C. C.; Medical Scintillation Spectrometry, *Nucleonics* 13:11, 82-88 (1955).