protests, wishes or interests. These are as nothing compared to the interests of commercialism.

In the past ten years I have been through experiences such as these several times and have had no means of recourse, either for myself or for members of the profession.

BRANSFORD LEWIS, M.D., St. Louis.*

The Causes and Treatment of Backache in Women

To the Editor:—Dr. Leon F. Garrigues, in his article with the above title in *THE JOURNAL*, January 2, has omitted one of the most important causes of backache, namely a peculiar chronic periostitis of one of the spinal processes, generally of a lumbar or sacral vertebra. The affection, according to my experience, is by no means a rare one, but very few physicians seem to recognize it. The characteristics are circumscribed pain on pressure on the affected process. The pain is present especially during the night when the patient is in a warm bed or on awakening in the morning; there is less or no pain during the day while the patient is about. There is slight elevation of temperature in the evening. The pain radiates sideways or downward; never ceases on its own account, but lessens and gradually will cease entirely under treatment for periostitis, which in this affection is one application of two leeches close to the spinal process from which the pain proceeds, and this promptly secures decided relief. The next step is painting the skin surrounding the affected spinal process once a day with tincture of iodine and internally iodid of potassium. According to my experience, this treatment has to be continued for a long period, because the pain, although continually diminishing, will only cease completely in the course of time.

The benefit experienced by the patient can not be overestimated. She is no longer treated for some uterine trouble which in reality does not exist or has nothing to do with the periostitis; and a constant drain on the system, leading to grave symptoms is gradually removed. The affection is easily recognized by pressing with the finger along the spine on all the processes and finding that one and one only of these processes is painful on pressure, and when, as stated, the pain is worse during the night. I have had over thirty years' experience with this peculiar affection, but except Dr. A. Jacobi, who first called my attention to it, I know of no physician who has written or spoken about it. How many women may be treated, often heroically, for uterine troubles, who suffer from nothing but this periostitis. I am not prepared to say anything concerning the etiology, but confine myself to the statement of facts. A. ROSE, New York.

Commercial Piracy of Scientific Work

To the Editor:—Our attention has just been called to the unauthorized use of an abstract of our report on "Chloral, Isopral and Bromural," as a "paid-reading notice" in the advertising pages of medical journals. In the interest of independent pharmacologic research, we take this occasion to register a protest against this common abuse. When an investigator publishes a report of his work, he makes his results common property, and thus voluntarily renounces his personal rights as to his results; but he does not thereby renounce his moral right to control the uses to which his report may be put. This right must be conceded, not only as a matter of justice to the man who has done the work and bears the responsibility, but also as an essential condition for independent scientific research. There can be no true liberty of research when the investigator must live under the fear that his name will be abused and his work misrepresented. The moral sense of the profession must protect these rights, which cannot be enforced by any other means. This principle applies strongly to the so-called "abstracts" which are prepared by the employes of manufacturers and published as advertisements. We contend that the unauthorized use of any abstracts for such purposes is reprehensible, since the manufacturers must know that such notoriety is repugnant to most scientific workers. The offense is made even more serious

by the fact that such abstracts very rarely do justice to the views of the investigators. An "abstract" is presumed, by its readers, to present fairly the main objects, results and conclusions of the investigator. A fair abstract can only be prepared by one who thoroughly understands the point of view of the investigator. The employe of a commercial house, even if he intends to be honest, cannot be expected to understand the point of view of an independent investigator, since his own training and surroundings are usually so very different. Consequently, these commercial abstracts are, of necessity, partial in nearly every case, partial in both meanings of the word. They misinform the public instead of informing; and they place the investigator, his objects, results and conclusions in a wholly false light.

The present instance illustrates these remarks very forcibly. Our report aimed, above all, to expose the inadequacy of the so-called "scientific evidence" for the claims of a commercial product, and our main conclusions bore on this point. Of this, our principal object, there is not even a mention in the so-called abstract. By this important omission, our attitude toward the subject is totally misrepresented. The whole form and especially the heading of the abstract, is framed so as to imply that the advertisement had been prepared or at least authorized by us—another gross and inexcusable misrepresentation. Pond's Extract is extolled as a certain cure for all kinds of injuries, but the close association of this discredited "patent medicine" with our names (both appearing on the same page of the journal) does not allay the present irritation. It merely illustrates that these methods of advertising are indistinguishable from those which have been so often denounced in the case of "patent medicines."

Manufacturers have often complained that independent investigators do not investigate their products. Do they blame a scientist for harboring small enthusiasm for work which exposes him to the dangers of having this sort of notoriety thrust upon him?

TORALD SOLLMANN, Cleveland, Ohio.

[Professor of Pharmacology and Materia Medica, Medical Department of Western Reserve University.]

ROBERT A. HATCHER, New York.

[Professor of Pharmacology, Cornell University Medical College.]

The Expression of O'Dwyer's Tube

To the Editor:—Some time ago I performed intubation on a child less than a year old, on account of membranous croup. Repeated attempts to extract the tube on the third day in the usual instrumental way, failed. The tube was loosely held within the larynx and every time the closed jaws of the extractor and the guiding finger touched its head, it would sink down out of reach. I was about to give up further attempts for the time being in order to give the child a little rest, when my obstetric sense asserted itself and Credé's method of placental delivery was applied. I was surprised at the ease with which I was able to express the tube out of the larynx and into the mouth, using my left hand for the external manipulation, while the index and middle fingers of my right hand were in the throat ready to receive the delivered tube.

I thought then that I had struck something original in this matter and reported it at the meetings of some medical societies. Before publishing it, however, I thought best to wait for some more experience with this method. The next patient on whom I had an opportunity to try it was a child about 10 years old. In this case, the method failed, but as the thread was left in and the child was very unmanageable, the method was not thoroughly tried. I felt then, that at least so far as young children were concerned I had discovered an additional, practical method of extubation, and saw visions of a permanent place for my name in the literature on intubation under the title of "Golden's method of extubation."

But my determination to wait for greater experience before giving this method to the world has ruined the prospects for the materialization of these visions. I was greatly disappointed to read in *THE JOURNAL*, Dec. 12, 1908, p. 2082, that this method, under the name of "enucleation," has already

1. *THE JOURNAL*, Aug. 8, 1908, p. 487.