

3000 children will be included in the trial, Marta Granstrom, a chief investigator in the study and an associate professor at the National Bacteriological Laboratory, said in a telephone interview from Stockholm.

The Swedish government, which manufactures vaccines for the country, used to produce whole cell whooping cough vaccine, but in the late 1970's it was revealed that its whooping cough vaccine had insufficient potency. Then, parents began to seriously doubt the safety of the Swedish whole cell vaccine. In 1979, the government stopped producing whole cell vaccine and, since then,

Swedish children have gone unvaccinated against whooping cough. In 1982 and 1983, Sweden was confronted with the worst whooping cough epidemic in decades. Because the disease runs in cycles, the next epidemic is expected in 1986 and the Swedes are racing against the clock to inoculate children.

The Swedes are working closely with CDC scientists to design the trial and maximize the opportunity to collect data. Granstrom said that the research team would consider testing another extract vaccine if another one had been properly tested for safety.

American scientists speculate that a

new extract vaccine might be on the market here within the next several years, if everything falls into place. An Institute of Medicine committee studying vaccine research reported in January that the public perception of adverse reactions to the whooping cough vaccine "is damaging generally to efforts to promote immunization and thus development of an improved vaccine merits special consideration."—MARJORIE SUN

This is the second of two articles on vaccines. The first article, which appeared in last week's issue, focused on vaccine compensation.

IOM's Future Under Review

Many members of the Institute of Medicine (IOM), the semiautonomous health policy branch of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), were puzzled by a missive last month from IOM president Frederick C. Robbins. In a two-paragraph memorandum, Robbins informed them of the "extremely constructive" deliberations over a study of the institute's future and passed along an equally mystifying resolution by the Academy's council expressing support for IOM. The missive was puzzling because few of the institute's members were aware that IOM's future is in doubt, and even fewer had seen a copy of the study to which Robbins and the resolution referred.

Late last year, a committee chaired by Robert Sproull, former president of the University of Rochester, recommended major structural changes that would have integrated the IOM into the Academy's bureaucracy by eliminating its authority to conduct its own studies, would have brought it more under the control of the Academy hierarchy, and would have altered the criteria by which it selects its members. The review committee was established last summer by Academy president Frank Press to examine the structure and function of the IOM. According to Philip Smith, the Academy's executive officer, the review was just one of a series of studies of the Academy's operations that were begun when Press took over in 1981. The review was generally perceived within IOM, however, as a potential threat to the 14-year-old institute's autonomy.

It is no secret that relations between the IOM and the Academy have not always been harmonious. The institute elects its own members who are chosen in part for their willingness to participate in policy studies rather than for their professional eminence alone. In contrast, the Academies of Sciences and Engineering are elite organizations whose members are supposed to be elected solely on the basis of their professional reputations. The institute also has its own professional staff which is separate from the National Research Council, the operating arm of the Academies of Sciences and Engineering.

The Sproull committee, whose report still has been circulated only among the top echelon of the Academy and IOM, recommended that the IOM bureaucracy be brought into the National Research Council, a move that would bring the day-to-day management of the institute's studies

more directly under the Academy's wing. It also recommended that the institute be renamed the National Academy of Medicine and that it develop new membership requirements. Academy members tend to look down on some IOM members whose prestige is in areas such as nursing, health economics, or law, rather than basic biomedical science. The possibility that the present membership be reduced drastically by attrition as their terms expire was raised speculatively. Finally, the Sproull committee recommended that IOM should undertake a broader range of health policy studies. In general, according to Robbins's interpretation, the report broadly supported IOM's basic mission and offered a mixture of criticism and praise of its performance.

The recommendations were reviewed by the IOM council in January and a detailed set of responses was forwarded to the council of the Academy. The IOM council rejected the notion that the institute be turned into a strictly honorific Academy of Medicine—a recommendation that was also firmly rejected by the Academy's council—and expressed concern that integration with the National Research Council would undermine IOM's identity.

At its meeting on 8 February, the Academy council decided to put off any decisions on implementing the Sproull report's recommendations until a new president of the IOM has been chosen to succeed Robbins, whose 5-year term of office ends in October. In essence, the council agreed that whoever is selected should have a role in deciding the future of the institute. The Academy has, however, decided to take control of the process of selecting Robbins's successor: the IOM's search committee, which was headed by Upjohn vice president Theodore Cooper, has been disbanded. A new nine member search committee has been named, with five persons chosen by Press and four by Robbins. NAS council member Paul A. Marks, who also belongs to the IOM, has been appointed chairman by the Academy. Cooper will be an IOM representative.

The Academy's resolution "doesn't say that any of the things (recommended by the Sproull committee) won't be done," notes Robbins. But any decisions should now involve the full participation of both institutions, he says. At the least, the members of both institutions may become aware that major changes are in the wind.—COLIN NORMAN