

A L'ÉDITEUR :

Dans le résumé de mon article "Classification of Leprosy" [*Leprosy Review* **32** (1961) 74-81], paru dans *THE JOURNAL* **29** (1961) 532, il est écrit: "Inclusion of a 'pure polyneuritic form' in primary classification is not approved, because it would include various kinds of cases the cutaneous lesions of which had disappeared." En effet, la forme polynévritique ne peut être qualifiée de pure que si l'évolution de l'infection s'est développée dans le système nerveux périphérique à l'exclusion de toute atteinte cutanée, sinon il s'agit d'une lèpre polynévritique secondaire ou résiduaire et non d'une lèpre polynévritique pure.

D'autre part la phrase suivante est incorrecte: "Adoption of a binary primary classification, 'benign' and 'malignant,' would have advantages, but a more detailed classification is undesirable." J'ai, en effet, écrit: "... but the usefulness of a more detailed classification is undeniable."

R. CHAUSSINAND

Institut Pasteur de Paris
Rue de Docteur Roux 25
Paris XV^e, France

[*Comment.*—About the first of the two objections raised by Dr. Chaussinand, the passage in *Leprosy Review* is, textually (including the italics): "*But we do not approve the inclusion, proposed by Wade and by the Indian leprologists, of a pure polyneuritic form in the primary classification.* We would then have in the same group patients

with tuberculoid and indeterminate leprosy, as well as lepromatous cases who only show polyneuritic lesions since their cutaneous lesions have disappeared." Dr. Chaussinand's letter corrects the confusing last passage and clarifies his views on the subject.

[Quite erroneously and regrettably, the original word "undeniable" in the article was transformed to "undesirable" in the abstract. Our file copy of the abstract shows evidence of a typist's error in reading the former word for the latter in the handwritten draft, and a less excusable oversight on our part when the final copy was check-read. —EDITOR.]