Reply

Reply by the authors[1]

Beat Kunz, Erika Sandmeier, Philipp Christen

Biochemisches Institut der Universität Zürich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, Ch-8057 Zürich, Switzerland

Received 20 December 1999

Edited by Giorgio Semenza

The first part of Dr. Forloni's comment is a review of previous work on PrP106–126 and does not need further exposition beyond that given in our earlier reply to the comment of Dr. Brown [1] concerning the report 'Neurotoxicity of prion peptide 106–126 not confirmed'.

In the criticism of our work, Dr. Forloni reproaches us for not having identified the putative contaminant(s) of our PrP106–126 preparation responsible for its neurotoxicity. This notion is hard to understand as we had not detected any toxicity in our batches of the peptide. Thus, there was no toxic contaminant to be chased. Difficult to understand is also the view that neurotoxicity should depend on where and when the peptide was synthesized. Different batches of the same peptide with a defined structure may safely be assumed to behave in identical fashion under identical conditions, i.e. to assume the same conformation and to have the same aggregation properties. We can but repeat what we wrote in our reply to Dr. David Brown's comment [1]. We are not convinced by the comments our report has elicited that we have missed an important experimental variable in attempting to observe the reported toxicity of PrP106–126.

Dr. Forloni concludes his comment with the advice that we should test several commercially available batches of PrP106–126. When we found the peptide to be non-toxic in our hands, we indeed contacted Dr. Forloni and asked for a sample that had proven neurotoxic in his laboratory. Unfortunately in vain. We still would welcome the opportunity to exchange peptide material between the two laboratories.

References

[1] Brown, D.R. (1999) FEBS Lett. 460, 559–560.

[1] PII: S0014-5793(99)01781-0

PII: S0014-5793(99)01782-2