© 1990 Nature Publishing Group http://www.nature.com/naturebiotechnology

CORRESPONDENCE

OPTICELL CORRECTION

To the editor:

The Fermentor and Bioreactor Tables in your May issue (*Bio/Technology* **8**:415) misstated the size characteristics of the two Opticell Culture System models. The model 5200R is currently capable of supporting a ceramic Opticore with a flat surface area of 0.42 m^2. The model 5300E can support multiple Opticores providing a range of flat surface area from 4.2–42 m^2.

In the same issue, the article "Integrated Design for Mammalian Cell Culture" on page 409 contained some inaccuracies regarding Opticell: In terms of large-scale production, data describing the direct scaleability of Opticell technology is available[1,2]. Currently in development is a CIP/SIP model capable of supporting up to 252 m^2 of flat ceramic surface area. A prototype has been constructed which is to be tested at a beta site in the future.

Karen A. Todd
Product Manager
Charles River Laboratories
251 Ballardvale St.
Wilmington, MA 01887

1. Pugh, G. G. and Bognar, E. A. 1987. Scaleability of mammalian cell culture bioreactors utilizing ceramic matrices. Proceedings, Biotech USA 1987.
2. Lyderson, B. K., Pugh, G. G., Paris, M. S. Sharma, B. P., and Noll, L. A. 1985. Ceramic matrix for large scale animal cell culture. Bio/Technology **3**:63.

MORE CHEMAP REACTORS

To the editor:

In addition to the Chemap equipment listed in the Fermentor and Bioreactor Tables (*Bio/Technology* **8**:415, May 1990), we also make the following models:

- Model CMF 3000, a stirred tank suitable for bacterial, mammalian, yeast, plant, and fungal cells, available in the following sizes: 3.5, 7, 14, and 35 liters;
- An airlift version of the Model 3000, suitable for the same cell types, with a volume of 20 liters;
- Model 3000 airlift suitable for microbial, insect, and plant cells, available in 14 and 25 liter sizes.

Berni Roberts
Alfa-Laval Chemap
CH-8604 Volketswil
Switzerland

NO BETTER THAN BAKING

To the editor:

In response to the article by Pamela Knight entitled "Nucleic Acid and Protein Blotting," (*Bio/Technology* **8**:465, May '90) we would like to point out that there is no real "crosslinking controversy."

The vast majority of researchers have successfully used *in vacuo* baking of nitrocellulose (NC) for many years. Our article in the Schleicher & Schuell newsletter *Sequences* presented data showing that there was no basis for claims that UV crosslinking was better than baking. We also found that when reprobing the membranes, more target DNA was lost on UV-crosslinked membranes, compared with baked membranes, over three successive reprobings. In response to our statement, "We find no evidence for increased sensitivity when target DNA was immobilized to NC-based membranes by UV-crosslinking," the article quotes John Bauer of Stratagene without really responding to our above statement, stating that "calibration and optimization of UV exposure time and intensity is crucial to achieve the higher sensitivities of which UV is capable." The Stratalinker™ used in our study was in fact provided by Stratagene for the specified purpose of comparative analyses; one would assume they would provide a unit in good working order, properly calibrated and ready for use. Optimization of UV exposure time was unnecessary because we used Stratagene's published optimal UV exposure (0.12 Joules), in addition to two UV exposures on either side of the optima. As it happened, we observed the same optimization point as Stratagene.

As to why we did not report standard deviations, we were simply using previously reported optima to examine sensitivity based on immobilization technique. Our intentions were not to conduct an in-depth analysis of UV exposures. By the way, where has Stratagene published standard deviations of this parameter?

We feel our study was a more precise indication of sensitivity than that previously published by Stratagene[1]. What Bauer neglects to say is that our data actually agree with theirs, in which equal sensitivity with UV crosslinking and oven baking of NC is shown in Fig. 2[1], although it is not discussed. In the interest of fairness, the author should have provided us with an opportunity (in the article) to rebut Mr. Bauer's criticisms.

Other errors also exist in this article. It appears not to have been carefully reviewed.

Sandra A. Nierzwicki-Bauer
Assistant Professor of Biology
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Joan S. Gebhardt
Ph.D. Candidate
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, NY 12180

1. Blakely, M. 1989. Stratagene UV crosslinker and Stratagene UV membranes. Stratagies **2(1)**:7.

ERRATA

To the editor:

Concerning the paper "High efficiency transformation of intact yeast cells by electric field pulses" (*Bio/Technology* **8**:223, Mar. '90), the authors wish to correct the following errors:

The distance between the electrodes, listed in the Experimental Protocols, is 3.0 mm instead of 2.6 mm as indicated in the text. Consequently, all electric field strengths in the text have to be divided by a factor of 1.15: i.e. in the legend for Figure 1, read 1.74 kV/cm instead of 2.0 kV/cm; 2.17 instead of 2.5 kV/cm; 2.35 instead of 2.7 kV/cm, etc.

E. Meilhoc
Assistant Professor
Universite Paul Sabatier
Institut National Des Sciences Appliquees
Avenue de Rangueil
31077 Toulouse Cedex
France

ERRATA

To the editor:

A mistake appeared in the paper "Genotyping of Bovine Kappa-casein following DNA sequence amplification" (*Bio/Technology* **8**:144, Feb. '90). In Figure 1, the orientation of PCR primer JK302 was reversed. Primer JK302 should read correctly 5′-GCCCATTTCGCCTTCTCTG-TAACAGA-3′.

J. F. Medrano
Assistant Professor
Dept. of Animal Science
University of California, Davis
Davis, CA 95616

A CORRECTION

In the research paper "Melanin production in *Escherichia coli* from a cloned tyrosinase gene" (*Bio/Technology* **8**:634, July '90), Figures 4 and 5 were mislabeled.

In Figure 4, the labels A and B should be transposed to correspond correctly to the legend. In Figure 5, the labels on the figure should be rotated 90° clockwise.