

ers' comments with names and signatures to the investigator, who would be allowed one rebuttal. Comments and rebuttal would then be available when the proposal is considered for funding.

WALTER E. STUMPF

Department of Anatomy,
School of Medicine, University of
North Carolina, Chapel Hill 27514

Appraising Psychotherapy

I choose to take a somewhat perverse pleasure in the fact that Eliot Marshall, in his article "Psychotherapy works, but for whom?" (News and Comment, 1 Feb., p. 506), found so much of my own article "Can psychotherapy research guide the policy maker?" (1) worthy of repeating. I do regret, however, that he did not quote from it fully enough to represent my views more faithfully.

The rather unflattering summary of the state of the art of psychotherapy which Marshall represented as my conclusion was in fact my synopsis of the position presented in the report of the President's Commission on Mental Health (PCMH) (2). One of the major points of my article was that the PCMH's appraisal was unwarranted. I do not believe I was being particularly obscure when I stated: "Practitioners will not and should not easily accept the modest assessment of their effectiveness." I followed this statement with a discussion of the limitations of assessment by diagnostic categories, which obscures the fact that the preponderance of patients who seek psychotherapy are effectively treated (1, pp. 301-302). Again on page 303 I discussed the shortcomings of the research on which the report of the PCMH was based and concluded, "In view of this fact, I am prepared to place but modest reliance on the present conclusions of the PCMH Report regarding psychotherapy."

I would be pleased indeed if Marshall's references to my statements had the effect of stimulating the reader to seek out my original article. It's really quite good.

MORRIS B. PARLOFF

Psychotherapy and Behavioral
Intervention Section,
Clinical Research Branch,
National Institute of Mental Health,
Rockville, Maryland 20857

References

1. M. B. Parloff, *Am. Psychol.* **34**, 296 (1979).
2. *President's Commission on Mental Health: Report to the President, 1978* (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978), vol. 4.

University-Industry Programs

I want to offer a constructive criticism of the outstanding article "Research, innovation, and university-industry linkages" by D. J. Prager and G. S. Omenn (25 Jan., p. 379). The authors have made a thorough, thoughtful, and balanced presentation of the crucial national needs, the many opportunities, and the serious impediments that control the establishment of university-industry R & D linkages. They suggest several actions or initiatives that the federal government can and should take in order to develop and enhance these vital interactions. They mention several exciting examples of successful industry-university cooperation. However, they do not cite and draw on the experience of a successful, ongoing, university-industry-government R & D program that is the perfect model for the activities and actions they propose. I refer to the National Sea Grant College Program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.

The Sea Grant Program was the vision of such farsighted individuals as Athelstan Spilhaus, John Knauss, Senator Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), and former Congressman Paul Rogers. It has grown from the germ of an idea in 1966 to a major national program that taps the reservoir of talent and expertise available in our nation's universities and directs it toward economically and environmentally sound development and use of this country's marine resources. The original act stressed the need for strong industry-university ties in effective joint R & D. Today, thanks to the continued interest, close oversight, and increasing support by Congress, the Sea Grant Program is mutually supported, university-based, and does for marine industries and businesses exactly what the authors propose on a general, nationwide basis.

Twenty-eight successful Sea Grant programs now exist. By building on the Sea Grant concept and principles, universities can initiate other industry-university linkages of the type recommended by Prager and Omenn.


DEAN A. HORN

Sea Grant Program,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Cambridge 02139

Erratum: In the report "Access of urinary non-volatiles to the mammalian vomeronasal organ" by C. J. Wysocki *et al.* (15 Feb., p. 781), the parts of Fig. 1 were inadvertently interchanged.

Erratum: In the report by R. G. Wyatt *et al.* "Human rotavirus type 2: Cultivation in vitro" (11 Jan., p. 189), in the sentence describing the porcine rotavirus plaque reduction test (p. 190, column 3, line 16), the concentration of pancreatin in the agar overlay should have been given as "0.15 percent of 2.5 percent pancreatin $4 \times \text{N.F.}$; Gibco."

High, wise and handsome



The MultiRac fraction collector

LKB's new MultiRac™ fraction collector is a real space saver. You can see that reservoir, column, pump, monitor and recorder can all mount on it easily. And you can keep adding decks to take as much more equipment as you want.

The new LKB fraction collector is smart too. It will collect from microliters to liters, adjust fraction size automatically according to OD, stop all flow as the head traverses, and on command will channel all void volume to waste.

Its good looks go well beneath the surface: solid state electronics, rugged materials of construction and a clear, bright, unambiguous LED display all make for an instrument that's safe, dependable and easy to use.

Contact LKB today for full details.

LKB

LKB Instruments Inc.
12221 Parklawn Drive Rockville, MD 20852
301: 881-2510 Telex: 8-9682

81A-313

Circle No. 284 on Readers' Service Card