

Sheffield's Hydrolyzed Proteins may eliminate the variability in your fermentation.



Switching to Sheffield's hydrolyzed protein as the primary nutrient in your fermentation media is a good move?

That's right. I should get more product *consistently* using Sheffield Hydrolyzed Proteins. In fact, the proteins are so consistent that the variations in yield that I used to get with the other nutrient sources, should not happen.

That's impressive.

Particularly so considering that Sheffield tailored their proteins to work well with our existing processes and to our specifications.

What about any increase in yields?

The high nutritive qualities of Sheffield's Hydrolyzed Proteins should increase our yields over the bulk media we were using in this particular fermentation.

Well, I can't risk extending my product's fermentation time hoping for possible higher yields.

Sheffield's product could *cut* my lag times, so time isn't wasted. And faster cycle times equals more batches.

And your yields increase enough to justify higher material costs?

I wouldn't switch if it wasn't profitable. We should use much less hydrolyzed proteins than bulk material, so material costs will be about the same. Plus our separation and purification costs should go down because there's less waste material per batch. The low viscosity requires less energy for aeration and mixing. We should win all the way around.

Sounds like lab/pilot run results.

Close to it. Basically, we're mixing our own lab-grade media in large quantities using Sheffield's Hydrolyzed Proteins. Many of the seed culture advantages carry over when we scale up.

Still, changing is a big step ...

We started by using Sheffield's products as nutrient boosters. The results were so good that we're making the total switch.

Hydrolyzed proteins, eh? Sounds like a good idea.

Talk to Sheffield. Their Hydrolyzed Proteins did a lot for me.

The above is a dramatization based on data obtained by Sheffield Products.

For detailed application assistance or product samples, contact the Sheffield Technical Services Department.

Sheffield Products

Kraft INC

P.O. Box 630, Norwich, New York 13815, 607-334-9951/TELEX 646056

LITIGATION

FRENCH-U.S. AIDS ACCORD

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In announcing the settlement of the international dispute over patent rights to blood-screening tests for acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS), President Reagan and French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac took the unusual step of helping to write—or perhaps rewrite—scientific history. The compromise agreement specifies that competing French and American teams will share the patent and will contribute 80 percent of royalties they receive from sales of AIDS screening kits to help support a new AIDS research foundation.

Back in December of 1985, the French group, directed by Luc Montagnier of Institut Pasteur (Paris), filed the first of several suits against the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the parent agency for the National Cancer Institute where Robert Gallo works. Lower federal courts in the U.S. decided in favor of HHS; however, the most recent ruling early this March by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit sided with the French group.

The settlement agreement acknowledges that the French researchers filed their U.S. patent application in September 1983, half a year earlier than did the U.S. group under Gallo's direction. However, the U.S. group received a U.S. patent, whereas the French group still has not.

A separate but related patent "interference" procedure also had been pending in which the validity of the French group's claim to a U.S. patent was raised within the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO). The settlement ends this interference procedure "without an award of priority." Instead, it grants "joint ownership" of the invention of an antibody detection method for AIDS. The agreement leaves the details of this co-invention to PTO officials, who are asked to "correct" both the Gallo and Montagnier patent applications to reflect this arrangement. Also ended are all pending lawsuits.

In explaining the settlement, the French and U.S. teams admitted that the dispute was not "in the best interests of public health or of science in general." And the scientists agreed that the battle had come to "distract the energies and resources of eminent scientists and their institutions from the task at hand, namely research into the dread disease AIDS."

—Jeffrey L. Fox