

REPORT NO. 116
THIRD QUARTER 1972
ISSUED MARCH 1973

RECEIVED
APR 9 1973

CDC LIBRARY
ATLANTA, GA. 30333

CENTER FOR DISEASE CONTROL

SALMONELLA

SURVEILLANCE

CONTENTS . . .

THIRD QUARTER 1972

I. SUMMARY

II. REPORTS OF ISOLATIONS

III. REPORTS FROM THE STATES

IV. SPECIAL REPORTS

V. INTERNATIONAL

PREFACE

Summarized in this report is information received from State and City Health Departments, university and hospital laboratories, the National Animal Disease Laboratory (USDA, ARS), Ames, Iowa, and other pertinent sources, domestic and foreign. Much of the information is preliminary. It is intended primarily for the use of those with responsibility for disease control activities. Anyone desiring to quote this report should contact the original investigator for confirmation and interpretation.

Contributions to the Surveillance Report are most welcome. Please address:

Center for Disease Control
Attn.: Salmonellosis Surveillance Activity, Epidemiology Program
Atlanta, Georgia 30333

SUGGESTED CITATION

Center for Disease Control: Salmonella Surveillance, July-September 1972
Issued March 1973

Center for Disease Control	David J. Sencer, M.D., Director
Epidemiology Program	Philip S. Brachman, M.D., Director
Bacterial Diseases Branch	John V. Bennett, M.D., Chief Eugene J. Gangarosa, M.D., Deputy Chief
Enteric Diseases Section	William H. Barker, M.D., Chief Matthew S. Loewenstein, M.D.*
Salmonella Surveillance Activity	William B. Baine, M.D. Peter A. Rice, M.D.*
Statistical Services	Stanley M. Martin, M.S. Robert A. Pollard, Jr., M.S.
Bacterial Zoonoses Section	Arnold F. Kaufmann, D.V.M., Chief Grace W. McConnell, V.M.D.
Epidemic Services Laboratory Section	George K. Morris, Ph.D., Chief
Office of Veterinary Public Health Services	Richard L. Parker, D.V.M., Chief

*Through June 1972

March 7, 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. SUMMARY	1
II. REPORTS OF ISOLATIONS	1
III. REPORTS FROM THE STATES	
A. Reports of Salmonella Outbreaks Received During the 3rd Quarter, 1972	2
B. Salmonellosis in Nurseries Due to Maternal Infection--New Jersey and North Carolina	4
IV. SPECIAL REPORTS	
A. The Role of Person-to-Person Transmission in Salmonellosis	5
B. Prolonged Carriage of Nontyphoid Salmonella	6
C. Recent Articles on Salmonellosis	8

III. REPORTS FROM THE STATES

A. Reports of Salmonella Outbreaks Received During the 3rd Quarter, 1972

This table lists investigated outbreaks of salmonellosis reported to CDC from various sources. Definitions of cases and of numbers at risk are not uniform from report to report. This listing should be considered neither comprehensive nor representative of all outbreaks in the United States as most outbreaks are probably not reported to CDC.

State	Month of Outbreak	Location	Serotype	Number					Mode of transmission	Comments
				Ill	At Risk	With Positive Cultures	Hospitalized	Deaths		
California	April	Annapolis	<u>S. enteritidis</u>	41	~100	6	0	0	?ham	YMCA camp. Ham ?cross-contaminated from chicken and turkey.
New Jersey	"	Dover	<u>S. typhimurium</u>	8	>150	8	7	0	person to person	Hospital outbreak.
"	"	Pemberton	<u>S. java</u>	16	52	49	1	0	?food	Outbreak after home-cooked food served at drug rehabilitation center.
Washington	April-May	Yakima	<u>S. typhi</u>	4	5	4	4	0	well water	Water contaminated by sewage from house of neighboring carrier.
New Jersey	May		<u>S. typhimurium</u>	12	?	12	12	4	person to person	Reported in detail in this issue.
New York	June	Oswego Co.	<u>S. kottbus</u>	~150	~200	≥32	?30-40	0	not identified	Two meals served at Elks' Club. Kitchen widely contaminated.
Alaska	June-July	Anchorage	<u>Salmonella B</u>	10	?	?	?	?	person to person	Prolonged trailer camp outbreak.
New Jersey	June-July		<u>S. saint-paul</u>	3	?	3	3	0	person to person	Nursery outbreak.
Alabama	June-August	Autauga Co.	<u>S. typhi</u>	7	?	7	4	0	not identified	Outbreak among children in several families after visit by carrier from Ohio.
Arizona	July	Apache Co.	<u>S. derby</u>	?	?	10	?	0	not identified	Outbreak among family and contacts on Indian reservation.
Arkansas	"	Yell Co.	<u>S. montevideo</u>	10	11	10	0	0	homemade ice cream--culture positive	Family outbreak.
Iowa	"	Marshall Co.	<u>S. typhimurium</u>	2	?	2	1	0	not identified	Family outbreak.
Kentucky	"	Falmouth	<u>S. chester</u>	11	>200	2	7	0	foot-long hot dogs with chili and onions	Restaurant outbreak. Positive cultures in food handlers.

Massachusetts	July	West Springfield	<u>S. typhi</u>	3	13	3
Missouri	"	Polk Co.	<u>S. newport</u>	1	?	3
Oregon	"	Portland	<u>S. manhattan</u>	1	4	3
Pennsylvania	"	Philadelphia area	<u>S. virchow</u>	?	?	11
"	"	Villanova	<u>S. enteritidis</u>	44	58	?
Virginia	"	Deltaville	<u>S. typhimurium</u>	45	75	17
Utah	July- August	Salt Lake City	<u>S. derby</u>	8	?	8
California	August	La Puente	<u>S. typhimurium</u>	69	118	47
Kansas	"	Douglas	<u>S. infantis</u>	12	12	12
North Carolina	"	Raleigh	<u>S. muenchen</u>	5	?	4
North Carolina	"	Stanly and Cabarrus Cos.	<u>S. newport</u>	9	49	4
Pennsylvania	"	Buckhorn	<u>S. braenderup</u>	7	7	5
"	"	Schuylkill Haven	<u>S. thompson</u>	31	~1000	15
Rhode Island	"	Washington Co.	<u>S. enteritidis</u>	10	172	11

3	0	carrier	Family outbreak.
1	0	not identified	Family outbreak.
0	0	not identified	Family outbreak.
1	0	not identified	Scattered cases--most in young adults.
?	?	gelatin salad, chicken salad	
3	0	homemade ice cream--culture positive	Outbreak at church supper
?	?	not identified	Citywide outbreak.
31	?2	?poultry	Retarded children's home.
11	0	homemade ice cream- ice cream & eggs culture positive	Outbreak after party.
3	0	person to person	Reported in detail in this issue.
3	0	deviled eggs	Church dinner.
3	0	homemade ice cream--culture positive	Cracked eggs used in making ice cream.
12	0	homemade coconut cream pie-- culture positive	Person making pie had positive culture, no symptoms.
2	0	not identified	Outbreak at resort hotel. Most cases among kitchen staff.

B. Salmonellosis in Nurseries Due to Maternal Infection--New Jersey and North Carolina. Reported by A. Todd Davis, M.D., EIS Officer, and Ronald Altman, M.D., State Epidemiologist, New Jersey State Department of Health.

In May 1972 a 2-day-old premature infant in a New Jersey hospital developed a severe Salmonella typhimurium infection. Despite intensive antibiotic treatment, the child died 6 days later. Epidemiological investigation revealed that the infant's mother had been admitted to the hospital in labor with a 3-day history of fever, vomiting, and diarrhea. Culture of her stool revealed S. typhimurium. A 2nd premature infant, sharing a room with the index case, subsequently developed S. typhimurium infection and died. A 3rd premature infant, in an adjoining room in the nursery, also contracted S. typhimurium infection but recovered clinically and was discharged home in midsummer. Two weeks later 1 of his siblings was hospitalized with severe gastroenteritis due to S. typhimurium. The same, 3rd, premature infant was subsequently placed in a home with several other foster children. One of these children thereupon became infected with S. typhimurium, was hospitalized on December 11, and died 4 days later. In addition, a full-term baby, who had been in the nursery at the same time as the index case, had become infected with this salmonella serotype. He was transferred to the pediatric ward, where 4 children in beds close to his also developed S. typhimurium infections. One of these was released from the hospital against medical advice, ostensibly to be taken to another hospital. Two days later this child was returned to the original hospital but had received no medical care in the interim and died 36 hours after readmission. In addition to the infections that occurred among children, S. typhimurium pyelonephritis was documented in October in a nurse who had cared for the premature infants. Her initial illness was succeeded in December by severe S. typhimurium gastroenteritis requiring inpatient treatment. She received an 8-week course of chloramphenicol without effect on her culture status, and it was not until March 1973, when her stool and bile cultures spontaneously reverted to negative, that she was permitted to return to work at the hospital. Control of the outbreak was ultimately achieved after successful cohort nursing techniques were introduced to insure that personnel working with infected children did not come into contact with other patients.

Reported by Brian Lauer, M.D., EIS Officer, and Martin P. Hines, D.V.M., State Epidemiologist, North Carolina State Board of Health.

In August 1972 an 8-day-old infant in a Raleigh, North Carolina, hospital developed meningitis due to Salmonella muenchen. The patient's 2 older siblings had had diarrhea in early July, and the mother of the index case had developed diarrhea 2 days before entering the hospital for delivery. Stool cultures of the index case, the mother, 1 sibling, and a newborn who shared the nursery with the index case were all positive for S. muenchen.

Control measures included culturing all hospital personnel who had contact with the mother and the index case, all of which were negative, and closing the nursery. The index case was treated with ampicillin and kanamycin and recovered satisfactorily.

Editorial Note: Outbreaks of salmonellosis in newborn nurseries traceable to index cases born to mothers with gastroenteritis have frequently been reported.^{1,2,3} Infants probably acquire the infection at birth by contact with the maternal perineum. Subsequent cases can occur among other infants through contact spread by the nursing staff. Contaminated fomites in the obstetrical area and nursery have also been implicated in propagating such outbreaks.^{4,5} Typically, the diagnosis of salmonella gastroenteritis in the mother of the index case is not made until detection of an outbreak leads to a retrospective investigation. By then dissemination of the salmonella may be widespread among personnel and in the hospital environment. The extent of such spread should be determined by a culture survey of patients and staff. Effective control measures include segregating infected babies, preventing nursing personnel who work with them from attending uninfected infants, and scrupulous handwashing by hospital personnel before and after every contact with an infant.

It would be far preferable to prevent the outbreak by appropriate prophylactic measures. A history of diarrheal illness should be sought from every woman presenting in labor to a hospital. Stool cultures should be obtained from all those complaining

of gastroenteritis. Meanwhile, babies born to mothers with a recent history of diarrhea should be segregated from other nursery children and placed under enteric isolation precautions until the possibility of their having acquired salmonellosis from their mothers has been ruled out. A recent legal decision⁶ emphasizes the responsibility of the hospital to insure that outbreaks of this kind do not occur.

References:

1. Epstein HC, Hochwald A, Ashe R, et al: Salmonella infections of the newborn infant. J Pediat 38:723-731, 1951
2. Fuerst HT: The epidemiology of salmonella infections in the city of New York. Bull NY Acad Med 40:948-960, 1964
3. Center for Disease Control: Salmonella Surveillance, April 1971, Rep No. 109, Sep 1971
4. Rubenstein AD, Fowler RN: Salmonellosis of the newborn with transmission by delivery room resuscitators. Am J Pub Health 45:1109-1114, 1955
5. Watt J, Wegman ME, Brown OW, et al: Salmonellosis in a premature nursery unaccompanied by diarrheal disease. Pediat 22:689-705, 1958
6. 14 infants contracted salmonellosis after childbirth in hospitals: Capelouto, et c. v. Kaiser Found. Hospitals, 500 P.2d 880, (California), Supreme Court of California. September 11, 1972. Public Health Court Digest 18:No. 8, 1972

IV. SPECIAL REPORTS

A. The Role of Person-to-Person Transmission in Salmonellosis.

It has been customary to state that most human salmonellosis is due to ingestion of contaminated food.¹ Transmission of salmonella infection from infected wild or domestic animals² to people has also been recognized. The role of contact transmission from one person to another in propagating human salmonellosis is generally considered to be a minor one.³ Nevertheless, person-to-person spread was suspected or documented in 6 of the 25 outbreaks of nontyphoid salmonellosis reported to the CDC in 1971 in which the mode of transmission was identified.⁴ The prominence of apparent interpersonal spread of infection in outbreaks of human salmonellosis reported to the CDC and its seeming conflict with traditional epidemiological teaching requires elaboration.

Definition answers to questions concerning risk of person-to-person spread in human salmonellosis and of its significance must await further research. Nevertheless, available evidence supports 4 statements:

1. Person-to-person transmission of nontyphoid salmonellosis is commonly a phenomenon of a specific type of setting.
2. An outbreak in such a setting is unusually likely to be detected and reported to CDC.
3. The precise degree to which transmission in such outbreaks is genuinely from person to person is not always clear.
4. Individual differences in host susceptibilities may be important in determining person-to-person spread of salmonella infection.

Information on the sources of infection in apparently sporadic cases of salmonellosis is not generally available. Most data on transmission of salmonellosis derive from investigations of outbreaks. The 6 reported salmonellosis outbreaks in 1971 in which transmission was believed to be person to person all occurred in hospitals. In salmonellosis person-to-person spread and cross-infection have repeatedly been observed as phenomena characteristic of outbreaks in hospitals,^{5,6} nursing homes,⁷ and similar institutions.

Only about 1% of the 2,000,000 cases of salmonellosis estimated to occur in the United States every year are reported to the CDC.⁸ Detection, investigation, and reporting of outbreaks of salmonellosis are probably no more complete. In contrast, it is to be hoped that outbreaks of salmonella infections occurring in a hospital would not often escape eventual notice. Thus, nosocomial salmonellosis outbreaks, and hence person-to-person transmission, are probably disproportionately represented in the tabulation of salmonellosis outbreaks reported to CDC.

A further consideration is that person to person transmission is commonly determined by exclusion when the epidemiologic evidence does not support common-source exposure. The extent of person-to-person spread in the purest sense is commonly impossible to determine in retrospect. Virtually anyone working on a hospital ward may be regarded as a sort of food handler, if only by virtue of his passing out trays or feeding patients. Thus the possibility of foods' serving as intermediary vehicles cannot be absolutely excluded in many outbreaks that superficially appear to be spread by contact transmission. Furthermore, extensive environmental contamination is commonly documented on a hospital ward that has a salmonella outbreak; one can only guess at the number of fomite-transmitted organisms a patient may be ingesting during a given period in the midst of such a setting.

A final consideration is that institutionalized subjects may represent a population that is unusually susceptible to ingestion of small doses of salmonella organisms.¹⁰ Thus, the concept that the healthy adult is unlikely to become infected by an inoculum of salmonella contracted directly from an excreter may not be pertinent in the case of infants, the elderly, or the ill.

The considerations discussed above do not rule out the existence of contact transmission of salmonella infection apart from nosocomial outbreaks. Nevertheless, outbreaks involving person-to-person transmission reported to CDC are not representative of all salmonellosis in the United States. Extrapolation of data from these outbreaks to make inferences about the mode of spread in most cases of salmonella infection is thus unwarranted.

References:

1. Salmonellosis. In Control of Communicable Diseases in Man. 11th ed, edited by Benenson AS. New York, American Public Health Association, 1970, pp 214-215
2. Lamm SH, Taylor A Jr, Gangarosa EJ, et al: Turtle-associated salmonellosis: I. An estimation of the magnitude of the problem in the United States, 1970-1971. Am J Epidem 95:511-528, 1972
3. Salmonella infections. In Preventive Medicine and Public Health. 9th ed, edited by Sartwell PH, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965, p 232
4. Center for Disease Control: Salmonella Surveillance Annual Summary 1971, Oct 1972
5. Datta N, Pridie RB: An outbreak of infection with Salmonella typhimurium in a general hospital. J Hyg 58:229-241, 1960
6. Sanders E, Sweeney FJ Jr, Friedman EA, et al: An outbreak of hospital-associated infections due to Salmonella derby. JAMA 186:984-986, 1963
7. Gotoff SP, Boring JR, Lepper MY: An epidemic of Salmonella saint-paul infections in a convalescent home. Am J Med Sci 251:16-22, 1966
8. Committee on Salmonella, Division of Biology and Agriculture, National Research Council: An Evaluation of the Salmonella Problem. Washington, National Academy of Sciences, 1969, p 32
9. Taylor J: Salmonella infections in hospitals. In Infection in Hospitals: Epidemiology and Control, edited by Williams REO, Shooter RA. Philadelphia, FA Davis Co, 1963, p 151
10. Lang DJ, Kunz LJ, Martin AR, et al: Carmine as a source of nosocomial salmonellosis. New Eng J Med 276:829-832, 1967

B. Prolonged Carriage of Nontyphoid Salmonella

The Salmonella Surveillance Activity is frequently requested to provide recommendations concerning the management of long-term excretors of nontyphoid salmonella. It is not uncommon, for example, for follow-up culturing after a sizable outbreak of salmonellosis to reveal that a minority of the patients have positive stool cultures for weeks to months after their initial exposure. Whatever the public health importance of carriers of salmonella among the general public, it is understandable that particular concern has been directed to carriers among food handlers and hospital personnel. The financial and administrative problems raised by prolonged carriage of the organisms in such groups are undeniable. Not uncommonly, positive cultures are found among food handlers when investigation of an outbreak is conducted. The positive culture may indicate that the food handler ate the contaminated food, that he

was coincidentally infected while handling raw contaminated food, or in some instances, that his infection antedated the outbreak and that he served as the source of contamination of the food. At any rate, there is understandable reluctance to allow food handlers to return to work while their cultures are still positive. Official Public Health Service recommendations state that food handlers with communicable diseases should be excluded from work during the time that they might serve as sources of contamination for food.¹ American Public Health Association recommendations specify that a food handler should not work until his stool cultures are free from salmonella for 3 successive days and furthermore stipulate that family contacts of those infected with salmonella should not be employed as food handlers during the period of such contact.² Adherence to such recommendations can impose a substantial financial strain on a food handler and his employer, particularly if the employee's cultures remain persistently positive.

Similar problems exist when salmonella excretors are detected among personnel in hospitals and similar institutions, as during investigations of nosocomial outbreaks. Although there are no official U S Public Health Service recommendations concerning salmonella carriage among hospital workers, the pertinent American Public Health Association recommendations² for those involved in care of patients, the young, or the elderly are the same as those for infected food handlers. Inasmuch as institutional outbreaks of salmonellosis not uncommonly involve asymptomatic infection of large numbers of staff members, adhering to APHS standards could not only produce hardship among those excluded from work but also temporarily create a critical personnel shortage in an affected hospital. It is not clear that interpersonal spread of salmonellosis in hospitals depends upon actual infection among staff members rather than mere passive transmission of the organisms from patient to another on the unwashed hands of staff. It is apparent that an effective method for eradicating salmonella carriage would be welcome. Much attention has been given to treatment of the carrier state in typhoid. Reasonable success in eliminating Salmonella typhi carriage has been obtained with antibiotic treatment, cholecystectomy, or both.³ To maximize effectiveness, antibiotic therapy has employed large doses of ampicillin or other drugs, sometimes administered intravenously⁴ or with probenecid⁵ for prolonged periods.

Unfortunately, the utilization of antibiotics in nontyphoid salmonella gastroenteritis has been unrewarding. There have been repeated demonstrations that treatment of acute salmonella gastroenteritis with such drugs probably serves only to prolong carriage of the organism.⁶⁻⁸ Specific attention to treatment of the chronic nontyphoid salmonella carrier has been scanty. Regimens that have been advanced have been notable chiefly for their unsatisfactory documentation of the true chronicity of the carrier state and for the ineffectuality with which they have cleared the organism.⁹⁻¹¹

Since no current regimen can be depended upon to eradicate nontyphoid salmonella from stools, it is probably best to withhold antibiotics and count on the great likelihood that the problem will be solved by spontaneous subsidence of positive cultures.

References:

1. Food Sanitation Section, Milk and Food Program, Division of Environmental Engineering and Food Protection, Public Health Service, U S Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Food Service Sanitation Manual (PHS Pub No. 934). Washington, GPO, 1962
2. Salmonellosis. In Control of Communicable Diseases in Man. 11th ed, edited by Benenson AS. New York, American Public Health Association, 1970, pp 214-215
3. Simon JH, Miller RC: Ampicillin in the treatment of chronic typhoid carriers: Report on fifteen treated cases and a review of the literature. New Eng J Med 274:807-815, 1966
4. Scioli C, Fiorentino F, Sasso G: Treatment of Salmonella typhi carriers with intravenous ampicillin. J Infec Dis 125:170-173, 1972
5. Kaye D, Merselis JG, Connolly CS, et al: Treatment of chronic enteric carriers of Salmonella typhosa with ampicillin. Ann NY Acad Sci 145:429-435, 1967

6. Aserkoff B, Bennett JV: Effect of therapy in acute salmonellosis on salmonellae in feces. *New Eng J Med* 281:636-640, 1969
7. Effect of neomycin in non-invasive salmonella infections of the gastrointestinal tract. *Lancet* 2:1159-1161, 1970
8. Geddes AM, Fothergill R, Goodall JAD, et al: Evaluation of trimethoprim-sulphamethoxazole compound in treatment of salmonella infections. *Brit Med J* 3:451-454, 1971
9. Gotoff SP, Lepper MH, Fiedler MA: Treatment of salmonella carriers with colistin sulfate. *Am J Med Sci* 249:399-403, 1965
10. Perkins JC, Devetski RL, Dowling HF: Ampicillin in the treatment of Salmonella carriers. *Arch Intern Med* 118:528-533, 1966
11. Smith ER, Badley BWD: Treatment of salmonella enteritis and its effect on the carrier state. *Canad Med Assn J* 104:1004, 1971

C. Recent Articles on Salmonellosis

1. Chau PY, Forrest CR: Further study of strontium selenite and selenite F broths for the isolation of Salmonella typhi. *J Clin Path* 25:966-969, 1972
2. DeRubertis FR, Woeber KA: Accelerated cellular uptake and metabolism of L-thyroxine during acute Salmonella typhimurium sepsis. *J Clin Invest* 52:78-87, 1973
3. Ewing WH: The nomenclature of Salmonella, its usage, and definitions for the three species. *Canad J Microbiol* 18:1629-1637, 1972
4. Geddes AM: A new look at infectious diseases: Enteric fever, salmonellosis, and food poisoning. *Brit Med J* 1:98-101, 1973
5. Howard-Jones N: Gelsenkirchen typhoid epidemic of 1901, Robert Koch, and the dead hand of Max von Pettenkofer. *Brit Med J* 1:103-106, 1973
6. Maclaren APC: Association of Salmonella dublin with abortion in cattle. *Vet Rec* 91:687-688, 1972
7. Nurmi E, Rantala M: New aspects of Salmonella infection in broiler production. *Nature (London)* 241:210-211, 1973
8. Salmonella agona: A new hazard. *Brit Med J* 4:559, 1972
9. Sardesai HV, Karandikar RS, Harshe RG: Comparative trial of co-trimoxazole and chloramphenicol in typhoid fever. *Brit Med J* 1:82-83, 1973
10. Stamps TJ, Wicks ACB: Trimethoprim-sulphamethoxazole (Bactrim) in the treatment of typhoid fever. *S Afr Med J* 46:652-655, 1972

TABLE I. COMMON SALMONELLAE REPORTED FROM HUMAN SOURCES, THIRD QUARTER, 1972

SEROTYPE	GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND REPORTING CENTER																																	
	NEW ENGLAND						MIDDLE ATLANTIC					EAST NORTH CENTRAL					WEST NORTH CENTRAL						SOUTH ATLANTIC											
	ME	NH	VT	MAS	RI	CON	NYA	NYB	NYC	NJ	PA	OHI	IND	ILL	MIC	WIS	MIN	IOW	MO	ND	SD	NEB	KAN	DEL	MD	DC	VA	WVA	NC	SC	GA	FLA		
<i>anatum</i>				14		1		5	2	3	5	1	1	10	4	2			2					1			3		2		4	15		
<i>bareilly</i>				1		1		2			1		2	3	3		1							1		1	1					2		
<i>blockley</i>	1		1	9		3		7	6	3	15	3	4	10	2	4	1		1		1			1	6		6		3		6	2		
<i>braenderup</i>			2			2				4	6				1			1							2							1		
<i>bredeney</i>						1		2		1	3			12	2	4			2				2		2						2	1		
<i>chester</i>										5	5		1				1			1						4		1						
<i>cholerae-suis v kun</i>										1					1															1	1	2		
<i>cubana</i>						1		1		1	2				1				1								1					1		
<i>derby</i>			2	3		3		5	1	10	8	10	6	7	3	3	2		1				1		10		7		1		9	15		
<i>enteritidis</i>			2	21	8	21		28	9	8	56	22	2	101	16	12	5	9	8	1	1			9	1	27	1	6	1	19	1	8	11	
<i>give</i>										1	1					1																1		
<i>heidelberg</i>				21		3		7	2	17	23	11	25	30	22	5	2	2	8					7	1	21		4		8		21	28	
<i>indiana</i>						1		4	2	4	7	3		5	2									1	11		1		1		6	4		
<i>infantis</i>			1	20	2	16		9	6	16	15	9	1	43	25	7	7	5	9	1			55	1	16		6		13	1	25	18		
<i>java</i>	1			12	1	2		3	3	4	4		1	15		3	1	6	2				2		2						2	2		
<i>javiana</i>			1	3		4				4	1	1		2	1	2									1				1	18	43			
<i>litchfield</i>			4			3		3	1	3			1	5	1				1					2		2		3		1		3		
<i>livingstone</i>														1																1				
<i>manhattan</i>			1					1	2	3	6	4	2	16	8	6			2						1		1	1		3	3	2		
<i>miami</i>						1		1																			1				2	19		
<i>mississippi</i>														1																2		19	3	
<i>montevideo</i>				1		1		2	2	2	7	4		5		3	1	3						3	2	7		1		2	1	3	11	
<i>muenchen</i>			1	4				4	4	4	4			10	1	3			1					3	4	6		1		9	2	2	13	
<i>newington</i>						1					1				1											4								
<i>newport</i>			1	8	1	8		22	19	21	35	16	4	41	25	16	13	4	14	2	1			11		4		5	4	25	6	41	69	
<i>oranienburg</i>				5		2		2	5	9	8	7	3	13	8	8	3		7		1							5		6	2	3	7	
<i>panama</i>				4		1		2		3	1			3		5									1		1							
<i>paratyphi B</i>				2				1				10	3	2	9			1		1				1			2		1					
<i>reading</i>	3			6	1	2		2	2				1	1		1											1		1					
<i>saint-paul</i>				10		7		24	9	24	35	11	3	11	5	9	8		2					2		28		1		11	1	10	24	
<i>san-diego</i>			1	11				1	4		12				2	7									2								2	
<i>schwarzengrund</i>				1										2	1															1				
<i>senftenberg</i>				2						2	4			3	3			1							1		3		2		2	3		
<i>nessee</i>						1		1		2		1		1	1	1								1									2	
<i>rompson</i>				12		4		5	1	2	18	2	4	22	9	6	2		2					2		5		3		3	1	9	8	
<i>typhi</i>				11	1	1	2	7	5	1	1	4	3	6	2	2	1		2			1		4	2	1	1	3	1	4	2	4	13	
<i>typhimurium</i>	5	1	4	101	11	63	1	75	42	81	94	36	43	111	76	83	52	26	51	9	11			22	5	53	4	92	5	56	3	62	60	
<i>typhimurium v cop</i>	1			18		6				5					10			3						6										
<i>weltevreden</i>								1					1		1																			
<i>worthington</i>				1						1			1		1																		1	
TOTAL	11	1	16	306	25	160	3	225	128	246	379	155	111	492	246	193	101	60	117	14	15	1	126	30	214	7	159	13	170	28	264	381		
ALL OTHER*	-	11	1	16	22	14	150	13	5	13	67	2	5	46	29	22	11	11	11	2	3	7	4	1	23	40	10	-	19	3	37	21		
TOTAL	11	12	17	322	47	174	153	238	133	259	446	157	116	538	275	215	112	71	128	16	18	8	130	31	237	47	169	13	189	31	301	402		

Note: NYA—New York, Albany; NYB—Beth Israel Hospital; NYC—New York City.

Beth Israel Hospital is a reference laboratory and this quarter serotyped a total of 315 cultures.

*See Table II.

TABLE I – Continued

GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND REPORTING CENTER																					TOTAL	% OF TOTAL	CUMULATIVE TOTAL	% OF CUMULATIVE TOTAL	SEROTYPE
EAST S. CENTRAL				WEST S. CENTRAL				MOUNTAIN							PACIFIC										
KY	TEN	ALA	MIS	ARK	LA	OKL	TEX	MON	IDA	WYO	COL	NM	ARI	UTA	NEV	WAS	ORE	CAL	ALK	HAW					
1	1		2		6		16				1		2	1			1	13	1	1	119	1.6	231	1.2	<i>anatum</i>
			1	2			1			1			1								27	0.4	57	0.3	<i>bareilly</i>
		4	1	3	5		2				9					1		9		1	130	1.7	351	1.9	<i>blockley</i>
		3		1	1	1	4				1							1			30	0.4	100	0.5	<i>braenderup</i>
1		1		1	7		3		1				1					3		1	53	0.7	148	0.8	<i>bredeney</i>
3																					21	0.3	41	0.2	<i>chester</i>
					1																6	0.1	16	0.1	<i>cholerae-suis v kun</i>
	3	2			3		6						13	13		4		15		6	172	2.3	455	2.5	<i>derby</i>
4	6	4	1	2	4		16		1		3		1	1		3	2	8	2		472	6.2	1,255	6.8	<i>enteritidis</i>
					3		5						1				1	10			25	0.3	64	0.3	<i>give</i>
4	14	14	3	11	20	1	19	1	5		3		3	3		6	10	30		1	416	5.5	1,065	5.7	<i>heidelberg</i>
	1	1			2																56	0.7	126	0.7	<i>indiana</i>
3	10	7	1	2	10	7	14		2		2		7			4	6	29	2	9	442	5.8	1,188	6.4	<i>infantis</i>
3	7	2			5			1			6			1			1	17	3		110	1.4	341	1.8	<i>java</i>
1	1	6		16	14		62		1		1		2				1	3			190	2.5	357	1.9	<i>javana</i>
	1				1		5						1								43	0.6	117	0.6	<i>litchfield</i>
							2						2								8	0.1	40	0.2	<i>livingstone</i>
	5	1			7			3									4	4			86	1.1	244	1.3	<i>manhattan</i>
							1														25	0.3	65	0.4	<i>miami</i>
	3	2	1	2	8		2														43	0.6	77	0.4	<i>mississippi</i>
	2	1		10	4		17				1		1	2		2		16		2	119	1.6	254	1.4	<i>montevideo</i>
	2	8	1	2	5		15						7			2		1	1	1	121	1.6	317	1.7	<i>muenchen</i>
													1					1		1	10	0.1	28	0.2	<i>newington</i>
3	15	16	9	44	15	2	109	1		1	10		14	6		1	4	28		25	719	9.4	1,475	8.0	<i>newport</i>
1	2	6	3		13	1	14				3		6	1				6		2	161	2.1	487	2.6	<i>oranienburg</i>
	1						5						3	1				11		20	63	0.8	140	0.8	<i>panama</i>
	2					1	8				1					1		5			53	0.7	138	0.7	<i>paratyphi B</i>
					1											2	5	4			33	0.4	71	0.4	<i>reading</i>
	4	1	2	4	8	1	9	1			1		1	1		2	4	15	3	2	294	3.9	672	3.6	<i>saint-paul</i>
		4			1								2					12		1	62	0.8	113	0.6	<i>san-diego</i>
						1	5				4			1		2		2		1	21	0.3	39	0.2	<i>schwarzengrund</i>
	1	1					6				1		2					5			42	0.6	129	0.7	<i>senftenberg</i>
							1									1		2			15	0.2	39	0.2	<i>tennessee</i>
	4	3	2	5	8	2	37				1					4	3	24		6	219	2.9	502	2.7	<i>thompson</i>
3	5			7	3	1	20						1	1		4	2	31			163	2.1	358	1.9	<i>typhi</i>
17	49	23	8	14	17	8	77	9	7		49		12	11		19	9	182	1	42	1,892	24.8	4,720	25.4	<i>typhimurium</i>
3	7			3	3		1	1	3				12		5			8		1	96	1.3	211	1.1	<i>typhimurium v cop</i>
1							1														39	0.5	88	0.5	<i>weltevreden</i>
	1						1											2			10	0.1	29	0.2	<i>worthington</i>
48	147	111	35	128	175	26	483	17	20	2	97	-	96	43	5	58	61	493	14	160	6,616	86.7	16,196	87.3	TOTAL
3	14	17	21	50	19	-	77	-	1	4	5	84	14	3	1	7	3	40	14	16	1,012		2,357		ALL OTHER*
51	161	128	56	178	194	26	560	17	21	6	102	84	110	46	6	65	64	533	28	176	7,628		18,553		TOTAL

TABLE III. COMMON SALMONELLAE REPORTED FROM NONHUMAN SOURCES, THIRD QUARTER, 1972

SEROTYPE	DOMESTIC ANIMALS AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT							ANIMAL FEEDS			
	CHICKENS	TURKEYS	SWINE	CATTLE	HORSES	OTHER	SUBTOTAL	TANKAGE	VEGETABLE PROTEIN	OTHER	SUBTOTAL
<i>anatum</i>		1	2				3	12		3	15
<i>bareilly</i>							—	5		4	9
<i>blockley</i>	1						1				—
<i>braenderup</i>							—				—
<i>bredeney</i>	1				1		2	2		4	6
<i>chester</i>		1					1				—
<i>cholerae-suis v kun</i>			2				2				—
<i>cubana</i>							—		5		5
<i>derby</i>			6				6				—
<i>enteritidis</i>			1				1				—
<i>give</i>		2					2				—
<i>heidelberg</i>		7		1		1	9			1	1
<i>indiana</i>							—				—
<i>infantis</i>	1					1	2	3		1	4
<i>java</i>							—				—
<i>javiana</i>							—				—
<i>litchfield</i>							—				—
<i>livingstone</i>							—				—
<i>manhattan</i>							—	1		1	2
<i>miami</i>							—				—
<i>mississippi</i>							—				—
<i>montevideo</i>							—	1		7	8
<i>muenchen</i>				6		2	8			1	1
<i>newington</i>							—				—
<i>newport</i>						5	5				—
<i>oranienburg</i>							—	2		5	7
<i>panama</i>							—				—
<i>paratyphi B</i>							—				—
<i>reading</i>		2		1			3				—
<i>saint-paul</i>		1					1				—
<i>san-diego</i>		3				1	4				—
<i>schwarzengrund</i>							—	9		1	10
<i>senftenberg</i>							—			2	2
<i>tennessee</i>							—	3			3
<i>thompson</i>	2						2				—
<i>typhi</i>							—				—
<i>typhimurium</i>	4	1	6	56	1	11	79			4	4
<i>typhimurium v cop</i>				4		1	5				—
<i>weltevreden</i>			2				2				—
<i>worthington</i>	6			1			7			2	2
TOTAL	15	18	19	69	2	22	145	38	—	41	79
ALL OTHER*	3	5	5	20	—	8	41	51	—	39	90
TOTAL	18	23	24	89	2	30	186	89	—	80	169

*SEE TABLE IV

TABLE III - Continued

WILD ANIMALS AND BIRDS	REPTILES AND ENVIRONMENT	HUMAN DIETARY ITEMS						MISCELLANEOUS	TOTAL	CUMULATIVE TOTAL	SEROTYPE
		EGGS AND PRODUCTS	POULTRY	RED MEAT	DAIRY PRODUCTS	OTHER	SUBTOTAL				
1	6 1			1		1	2		27	57	<i>anatum</i>
	2						-	1	11	22	<i>bareilly</i>
	1				1		-		1	10	<i>blockley</i>
	1	1			1		2		4	14	<i>braenderup</i>
					1		1	11	21	36	<i>bredeney</i>
							-		1	2	<i>chester</i>
							-		2	3	<i>cholerae-suis v kun</i>
							-	1	6	33	<i>cubana</i>
	1			1			1	2	10	51	<i>derby</i>
	1						-		2	16	<i>enteritidis</i>
					1		1		3	21	<i>give</i>
							-		10	49	<i>heidelberg</i>
1				1	1	1	4		-	3	<i>indiana</i>
1	6	1		1	1	1	4		11	43	<i>infantis</i>
				1			1		8	28	<i>java</i>
	2						-		-	1	<i>javana</i>
							-		2	9	<i>litchfield</i>
							-		-	7	<i>livingstone</i>
1	1						-		4	24	<i>manhattan</i>
							-		-	-	<i>miami</i>
	2						-		-	-	<i>mississippi</i>
1							-	1	10	52	<i>montevideo</i>
							-	1	11	17	<i>muenchen</i>
	3			4			4	1	1	2	<i>newington</i>
							-	1	13	58	<i>newport</i>
	1						-		8	32	<i>oranienburg</i>
							-		-	2	<i>panama</i>
	1						-		1	13	<i>paratyphi B</i>
							-		3	5	<i>reading</i>
3	1	1		1	1	11	14	1	20	70	<i>saint-paul</i>
							-		4	7	<i>san-diego</i>
							-		10	18	<i>schwarzengrund</i>
			5				5		7	57	<i>senftenberg</i>
							-		3	30	<i>tennessee</i>
		1				1	2		4	22	<i>thompson</i>
							-		-	2	<i>typhi</i>
10	4				1	1	2	6	105	217	<i>typhimurium</i>
	1						-		6	17	<i>typhimurium v cop</i>
							-		2	2	<i>weltevreden</i>
							-		9	19	<i>worthington</i>
18	34	4	5	9	6	15	39	25	340	1,071	TOTAL
3	10	-	-	4	1	8	13	36	193	629	ALL OTHER
21	44	4	5	13	7	23	52	61	533	1,700	

TABLE IV. OTHER SALMONELLAE REPORTED FROM NONHUMAN SOURCES, THIRD QUARTER, 1972

SEROTYPE	DOMESTIC ANIMALS AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT							ANIMAL FEEDS			
	CHICKENS	TURKEYS	SWINE	CATTLE	HORSES	OTHER	SUBTOTAL	TANKAGE	VEGETABLE PROTEIN	OTHER	SUBTOTAL
<i>agona</i>						2	2	3			3
<i>amager</i>							—	1			1
<i>berta</i>				3			3				—
<i>binza</i>							—			5	5
<i>brandenburg</i>						1	1				—
<i>cerro</i>							—	6			6
<i>champaign</i>							—			1	1
<i>cholerae-suis</i>			5				5				—
<i>denver</i>						1	1				—
<i>drypool</i>							—	6			6
<i>dublin</i>				12			12				—
<i>eimsbuettel</i>							—	14		5	19
<i>goeteborg</i>				1			1				—
<i>habana</i>							—	1		3	4
<i>jamaica</i>							—				—
<i>johannesburg</i>							—	1		1	2
<i>kaapstad</i>						1	1				—
<i>kentucky</i>							—	3		4	7
<i>lexington</i>							—			3	3
<i>london</i>							—			1	1
<i>manila</i>							—			1	1
<i>matadi</i>							—				—
<i>meleagridis</i>		2					2	1		3	4
<i>molade</i>							—			1	1
<i>orion</i>							—			1	1
<i>oslo</i>				3			3				—
<i>poona</i>							—				—
<i>pullorum</i>	3					1	4				—
<i>rubislaw</i>							—				—
<i>siegburg</i>							—	6		8	14
<i>sundsvall</i>		1					2				—
<i>taksony</i>						1	—				—
<i>thomasville</i>							—			2	2
<i>urbana</i>							—				—
<i>virchow</i>							—				—
<i>wassenaar</i>							—				—
<i>weston</i>							—				—
TOTAL	3	3	5	19	—	7	37	42	—	39	81
NOT TYPED*	—	2	—	1	—	1	4	9	—	—	9
TOTAL	3	5	5	20	—	8	41	51	—	39	90

*SEE TABLE VB

TABLE IV - Continued

WILD ANIMALS AND BIRDS	REPTILES AND ENVIRONMENT	HUMAN DIETARY ITEMS						MISCELLANEOUS	TOTAL	CUMULATIVE TOTAL	SEROTYPE
		EGGS AND PRODUCTS	POULTRY	RED MEAT	DAIRY PRODUCTS	OTHER	SUBTOTAL				
							-	3	8	12	<i>agona</i>
							-		1	1	<i>amager</i>
							-		3	10	<i>berta</i>
							-		5	14	<i>binza</i>
							-		1	1	<i>brandenburg</i>
							-		6	29	<i>cerro</i>
							-		1	1	<i>champaign</i>
							-		5	38	<i>cholerae-suis</i>
							-		1	1	<i>denver</i>
							-		6	24	<i>drypool</i>
							-		12	12	<i>dublin</i>
							-		19	64	<i>eimsbuettel</i>
	1						-		1	1	<i>goeteborg</i>
	1						-		5	11	<i>habana</i>
							-		1	1	<i>jamaica</i>
	1						-		3	22	<i>johannesburg</i>
							-		1	1	<i>kaapstad</i>
							-		7	30	<i>kentucky</i>
	1						-		4	6	<i>lexington</i>
				2			2		3	3	<i>london</i>
							-		1	19	<i>manila</i>
	1						-		1	2	<i>matadi</i>
							-		6	14	<i>meleagridis</i>
							-		1	1	<i>molade</i>
							-		1	8	<i>orion</i>
							-	1	4	4	<i>oslo</i>
2							-		2	16	<i>poona</i>
							-		4	11	<i>pullorum</i>
						1	1		1	2	<i>rubislaw</i>
							-		14	40	<i>siegburg</i>
							-		2	2	<i>sundsvall</i>
							-	1	1	1	<i>taksony</i>
	2						-		2	24	<i>thomasville</i>
	1						-		2	11	<i>urbana</i>
							-		1	1	<i>virchow</i>
	1						-		1	1	<i>wassenaar</i>
					1		1		1	1	<i>weston</i>
2	9	-	-	2	1	1	4	5	138	524	TOTAL
1	1	-	-	2	-	7	9	31	55	105	NOT TYPED
3	10	-	-	4	1	8	13	36	193	629	TOTAL

TABLE V. SALMONELLAE REPORTED BY GROUP IDENTIFICATION ONLY
THIRD QUARTER, 1972

A. HUMAN SOURCES

REPORTING CENTER	GROUP													TOTAL
	B	C	C1	C2	D	E	E1	E2	E3	F	G	I	UNK	
ALASKA	11			1	2									14
ARKANSAS	3		3	5	4			1						16
CALIFORNIA													1	1
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	25		1	1	2								11	40
GEORGIA			1											1
ILLINOIS			1										1	2
IOWA		1												1
MARYLAND	1													1
MICHIGAN													1	1
MISSISSIPPI	9		1	4	1						4		1	20
MISSOURI	1													1
NEBRASKA	5		1		1									7
NEVADA							1							1
NEW HAMPSHIRE	7			1	1	1							1	11
NEW MEXICO	39		26	13	3	2							1	84
NEW YORK - A	21	8		35	1							1	84	150
NEW YORK - C	2													2
OREGON	1		1											2
RHODE ISLAND	7	1	1	3	5								5	22
TEXAS				2										2
UTAH					1									1
WISCONSIN	3												4	7
WYOMING						2							1	3
TOTAL	135	10	36	65	21	5	1	1	-	-	4	1	111	390

B. NON-HUMAN SOURCES

REPORTING CENTER	GROUP													TOTAL
	B	C	C1	C2	D	E	E1	E2	E3	F	G	I	UNK	
DOMESTIC ANIMALS AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT				1									3	4
ANIMAL FEEDS									9					9
WILD ANIMALS AND BIRDS	1													1
REPTILES AND ENVIRONMENT			1											1
HUMAN DIETARY ITEMS	2			6									1	9
MISCELLANEOUS	10		2	9	3	5				1			1	31
TOTAL	13	-	3	16	3	5	-	-	9	1	-	-	5	55

STATE EPIDEMIOLOGISTS AND STATE LABORATORY DIRECTORS

The State Epidemiologists are the key to all disease surveillance activities. They are responsible for collecting, interpreting, and transmitting data and epidemiologic information from their individual States; their contributions to this report are gratefully acknowledged. In addition, valuable contributions are made by State Laboratory Directors; we are indebted to them for their valuable support.

<i>STATE</i>	<i>STATE EPIDEMIOLOGIST</i>	<i>STATE LABORATORY DIRECTOR</i>
Alaska	Frederick S. Wolf, M.D.	Thomas S. Hosty, Ph.D.
Arizona	Donald K. Freedman, M.D.	Frank P. Pauls, Dr.P.H.
Arkansas	Philip M. Hotchkiss, D.V.M.	H. Gilbert Crecelius, Ph.D.
California	G. Doty Murphy, III, M.D.	Robert T. Howell, Dr.P.H.
Colorado	James Chin, M.D.	Edwin H. Lannette, M.D.
Connecticut	Thomas M. Vernon, Jr., M.D.	C. D. McGuire, Ph.D.
Delaware	James C. Hart, M.D.	William W. Ullmann, Ph.D.
District of Columbia	Ernest S. Tierkel, V.M.D.	Mahadeo P. Verma, Ph.D.
Florida	William E. Long, M.D.	Alton Shields, Dr.P.H.
Georgia	Ralph B. Hogan, M.D.	Nathan J. Schneider, Ph.D.
Hawaii	John E. McCroan, Ph.D.	Earl E. Long, M.S.
Idaho	Ned Wiebenga, M.D.	George Chen
Illinois	John A. Mather, M.D.	Owen L. Carpenter
Indiana	Byron J. Francis, M.D.	Richard Morrissey, M.P.H.
Iowa	Charles L. Barrett, M.D.	Josephine Van Fleet, M.D.
Kansas	Arnold M. Reeve, M.D.	W. J. Hausler, Jr., Ph.D.
Kentucky	Don E. Wilcox, M.D.	Nicholas D. Duffett, Ph.D.
Louisiana	Calixto Hernandez, M.D.	B. F. Brown, M.D.
Maine	Charles T. Caraway, D.V.M.	George H. Hauser, M.D.
Maryland	Timothy R. Townsend, M.D. (Acting)	Charles Okey, Ph.D.
Massachusetts	John D. Stafford, M.D.	Robert L. Cavenaugh, M.D.
Michigan	Nicholas J. Fiumara, M.D.	Morton A. Madoff, M.D.
Minnesota	Norman S. Hayner, M.D.	Kenneth R. Wilcox, Jr., M.D.
Mississippi	D. S. Fleming, M.D.	Henry Bauer, Ph.D.
Missouri	Durward L. Blakey, M.D.	R. H. Andrews, M.S.
Montana	H. Denny Donnell, Jr., M.D.	Elmer Spurrier, Dr.P.H.
Nebraska	Steven Kairys, M.D.	David B. Lackman, Ph.D.
Nevada	Russell W. Currier, D.V.M.	Henry McConnell, Dr.P.H.
New Hampshire	William M. Edwards, M.D.	Paul Fugazzotto, Ph.D.
New Jersey	Vladas Kaupas, M.D.	Robert A. Miliner, Dr.P.H.
New Mexico	Ronald Altman, M.D.	Martin Goldfield, M.D.
New York City	Nancy C. McCaig, M.D.	Daniel E. Johnson, Ph.D.
New York State	Pascal J. Imperato, M.D.	Paul S. May, Ph.D.
North Carolina	Alan R. Hinman, M.D.	Donald J. Dean, D.V.M.
North Dakota	Martin P. Hines, D.V.M.	Lynn G. Maddry, Ph.D.
Ohio	Kenneth Mosser	C. Patton Steele, B.S.
Oklahoma	John H. Ackerman, M.D.	Charles C. Croft, Sc.D.
Oregon	Stanley Ferguson, Ph.D.	William R. Schmieding, M.D.
Pennsylvania	John A. Googins, M.D.	Gatlin R. Brandon, M.P.H.
Puerto Rico	W. D. Schrack, Jr., M.D.	James E. Prier, Ph.D.
Rhode Island	Luis Mainardi, M.D.	Eduardo Angel, M.D.
South Carolina	James R. Allen, M.D. (Acting)	Malcolm C. Hinchliffe, M.S.
South Dakota	William B. Gamble, M.D.	Arthur F. DiSalvo, M.D.
Tennessee	Robert S. Westaby, M.D.	B. E. Diamond, M.S.
Texas	Robert H. Hutcheson, Jr., M.D.	J. Howard Barrick, Dr.P.H.
Utah	M. S. Dickerson, M.D.	J. V. Irons, Sc.D.
Vermont	Taira Fukushima, M.D.	Russell S. Fraser, M.S.
Virginia	Geoffrey Smith, M.D.	Dymitry Pomar, D.V.M.
Washington	Karl A. Western, M.D.	Frank W. Lambert, Ph.D.
West Virginia	John Beare, M.D. (Acting)	Jack Allard, Ph.D.
Wisconsin	N. H. Dyer, M.D.	J. Roy Monroe, Ph.D.
Wyoming	H. Grant Skinner, M.D.	S. L. Inhorn, M.D.
	Herman S. Parish, M.D.	Donald T. Lee, Dr.P.H.