every case the resulting product was only partially soluble in water, giving a cloudy solution which cleared on adding a trace of NaOH. In my experience it is not possible to prepare a compound represented by formula D suitable for clinical use. I am of the opinion that the incomplete solubility of these substances is due to the incomplete combination of 606 with the formaldehyde/bisulphite with resultant precipitation of some 606. I enclose representative specimens of the results of my experiments in this direction. These were prepared by treating each molecule of 606 with 1·5 mols. of formald./bisulph., the extra ½ mol. being necessary in my experience for the preparation of even normal sulpharsphenamines.

The percentage of arsenic which would be present in the compounds represented by formulæ D, E and F is also of some importance and research here and elsewhere indicates that normal sulpharsphenamine is either the — NNN^1-substituted product (F) or a mixture of E with about one molecule of sodium formaldehyde bisulphite. The B.P gives the percentage of As as 18–21 and hence on this alone normal sulpharsphenamine cannot be represented by formulæ D and E as the following table shows. These calculations are made on the pure substance with 5% H_2O, this being an average amount of humidity present in normal sulpharsphenamines.

Col. Burke's Formula	Substituting Chains	% As in Pure Substance with 5% H_2O
D . .	One—N	30%
E . .	Two—NN_1	23·8%
F . .	Three—NNN_1	20%

As the paper indicates the formula for sulpharsphenamine seems to be in some doubt, but in computing this I think it essential to take into account the percentage of As. allowed by the authorities and desirable from a practical manufacturing viewpoint.

I should be extremely grateful for comments on my observations and thank you in anticipation.

Yours, etc.,
E. A. LUM, Ph.C., M.P.S

SULFARSENOL LABORATORIES LTD.,
ALPERTON, MIDDLESEX.

ERRATUM

On page 114 of the January–April, 1941, number, at the end of line 26 *for* essay *read* assay.