

①

REPORT DO

AD-A230 145

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified				3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY				4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) NMRI 90-108			
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE				5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Naval Medical Research		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable)		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Naval Medical Command			
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Bethesda, Maryland 20814-5055				7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20372-5120			
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Naval Medical Research and Development Command		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable)		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER			
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Bethesda, Maryland 20814-5055				10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Malaria Vaccines (Letter)	
PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 63807A		PROJECT NO. 3M463807.D808		TASK NO. A0133		WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. DA301569	
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Herrington D, Hoffman SL, Levine MM, Gordon DM							
13a. TYPE OF REPORT article		13b. TIME COVERED FROM TO		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1990		15. PAGE COUNT 1	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Reprinted from Science 1990 Vol.248 pp.422							
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)				
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Plasmodium falciparum, recombinant vaccine, malaria vaccine, antisporezoite immunity, synthetic peptide vaccine, circumsporezoite protein, sporezoite				
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)						Accession For	
<p style="text-align: center;"> DTIC ELECTE DEC 20 1990 S B D </p>						NTIS SPA&I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
						DTIC TAB <input type="checkbox"/>	
						Unannounced <input type="checkbox"/>	
						Justification <input type="checkbox"/>	
						By	
						Distribution/	
						Availability Codes	
						Avail and/or Special	
						Dist	
						A-1 20	
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS				21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Phyllis Blum, Information Services Division				22b. TELEPHONE (include Area Code) 202-295-2188		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL ISD/ADMIN/NMRI	

Malaria Vaccines

It was with great surprise that I read the description of our work in your correspondent Jeremv Cherfas' article "Malaria vaccines: The failed promise" (*News & Comment*, 26 Jan., p. 402). Our 1987 paper (1) reported the results of a malaria vaccine trial in monkeys, not humans, while our 1988 paper (2) reported the results of a malaria vaccine trial in humans. Both of our papers showed good protection against infection. The trial carried out last spring by Bill Collins and his associates in the Malaria Branch of the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia, was in monkeys, not humans.

Perhaps Cherfas was misinformed, but what Collins describes as "slight differences" between our monkey trial (repeated several times by our group with results similar to those we published in 1987) and his monkey trial were described in a report (3) to the World Health Organization's Lindsay Martinez as follows: "We feel that the most likely explanation for the different serologic responses in animals immunized with the peptide mixtures in Atlanta and Colombia was a problem with the peptide—BSA conjugation procedure. This probably also explains the lack of protection in the two groups of animals immunized with a mixture of 3 peptides in Atlanta."

Perhaps most disturbing is the statement by Cherfas that "Patarroyo has not given up. . . [T]here is 'tremendous excitement' in Venezuela and Colombia. . . [but] few scientists outside those countries share wholeheartedly in that enthusiasm." This implies that no one believes good science can be carried out in developing countries. In our view, science exists only in two forms—good or bad; and good science, like truth, is based on facts. Our clinical trials in humans are under way, and their results should settle the issue.

MANUEL ELKIN PATARROYO
 Director, Instituto de Immunología,
 Hospital de San Juan de Dios,
 Bogotá, Colombia

REFERENCES

1. M. E. Patarroyo et al., *Nature* 328, 629 (1987).
2. M. E. Patarroyo et al., *ibid.* 332, 158 (1988).
3. G. H. Campbell, T. K. Ruebush II, W. E. Collins, personal communication.

Cherfas states that "In two trials of different vaccines only one of nine subjects was protected—and even that case is suspect." As the senior investigators who ran the trials, we can attest that one of three volun-

teers immunized with a synthetic peptide conjugate vaccine (NANP)₃-TT was protected against sporozoite challenge (1), and one of six immunized with a recombinant vaccine FSVI was protected (2). Andy Waters, a molecular biologist who was not involved in either clinical trial, is cited as suggesting that an allergic reaction to the vaccine was responsible for the subsequent protection against malaria. We are unaware that persons can be protected from a sporozoite challenge by virtue of an allergic reaction stimulated 12 months previously and think it is far more likely that specific vaccine-induced ant sporozoite immunity was responsible. This interpretation of the results is supported by the fact that, in both clinical trials, the vaccinated individuals had significantly longer prepatent intervals than did unimmunized control subjects, which indicates that vaccination stimulated some degree of ant sporozoite activity, albeit a level that was completely protective in only two of the nine vaccinees. We believe these results provide evidence that biologically relevant ant sporozoite antibodies can be stimulated by subunit vaccines.

Furthermore, in contrast to what is stated in the article, there are no data demonstrating any significant variation in the central repeat region of the *Plasmodium falciparum* circumsporozoite protein. This apparently invariant region remains an excellent target for protective antibodies. A major challenge is to design vaccines that consistently induce higher concentrations of such antibodies.

DEIRDRE HERRINGTON
 Center for Vaccine Development,
 University of Maryland School of Medicine,
 Baltimore, MD 21201

STEPHEN L. HOFFMAN
 Malaria Program,
 Naval Medical Research Institute,
 Bethesda, MD 20892

MYRON M. LEVINE
 Center for Vaccine Development,
 University of Maryland School of Medicine

DANIEL M. GORDON
 Department of Immunology,
 Walter Reed Army Institute for Research,
 Washington, DC 20307

REFERENCES

1. D. A. Herrington et al., *Nature* 328, 257 (1987).
2. W. R. Ballou et al., *Lancet* i, 1277 (1987).

It is true that the promise of a malaria vaccine seems as distant in 1990 as it did in 1985, if not more so. However the same is also true of many areas of biotechnology. Attempts to find the elusive malaria vaccine should certainly be subjected to scrutiny and, where necessary, shortfalls highlighted and admitted. The public has a right to be

kept thoroughly informed about the progress being made when its money is made available for such research. But to concentrate purely on the "failure" to find a vaccine is to overlook the huge contribution that the "search" has made to the understanding of the basic biology of the parasite and the nature of its interaction with the host immune system. For instance, selective pressure on the circumsporozoite (CS) protein results not in myriad sequence variation but instead in limited changes focused on small, distinct regions of the protein which have been shown to elicit immune responses. This, when allied with our increasing knowledge of host genetics and immune effectors, suggests that a CS-based vaccine holds more promise than it did 5 years ago.

Cherfas uses a fragmentary quote of mine to imply the complete failure of the CS protein vaccine trials. While I do not have perfect recall of our conversation, I remember also enthusing about progress in the field. An individual exhibiting an allergic response may clear a challenge of parasites for one of two reasons, either because of a specific ant sporozoite response or a non-specific reaction. I believe that I made these two options clear to Cherfas. If not, then I would like to take this opportunity to do so. It would have been quite simple to confirm the facts with one of the authors of the study.

The vaccination against malaria is one of the most complicated biological puzzles that man has attempted to solve. If it seems that the public has been misled into believing that it would be a simple process, then that is indeed unfortunate. It would be unfair to the scientists involved to ignore that the last 5 years have produced a much more detailed picture of the object of that challenge.

A. P. WATERS
 Laboratory of Parasitic Disease,
 National Institute of Allergy and
 Infectious Disease,
 Bethesda, MD 20892

Light Bending: Prediction and Theory

Stephen Brush (Articles, 1 Dec., p. 1124) gives an interesting account of the shifting importance of light bending as evidence for relativity. He appears, however, to have mixed this up with the question of falsifiability, apparently because of Popper's report of being led to the notion by Einstein's prediction of light bending prior to observation of the effect.

The central historical facts seem to be two. First in the early days of relativity, scientists were substantially more impressed