

# Response to Commentary

## Author's Reply to Commentary by Hennig Stieve

Received 31 August 1995

el it to be appropriate to concentrate on the scientific facts in replying to Prof. Stieve's reproach. However, this does imply that I agree with his description of the history of this er after my leaving his team against his will.

. The absorbance changes are in fact very small, but nevertheless quantitatively analyzable. Their size is in the same range described in the paper of Schnetkamp which was cited by f. Stieve. The addition of plain buffer solution evoked signals being about half the size of the signals evoked by cGMP. In the previous, rejected version of the manuscript we, in fact, presented a Fig. 2 showing two signals: (a) a buffer 'signal' which was always present and (b) a cGMP evoked signal from which the buffer 'signal' had been subtracted. Since this figure caused confusion, I have modified it in such a way that only real cGMP effect after subtraction of the buffer 'signal' is presented; in doing this, I followed the advice of K. Nagy, or co-worker of Prof. Stieve.

. Prof. Stieve claims that he and his co-workers were unable to reproduce my results even though exactly following my instructions. Moreover, he states that I did not respond to his corrective letter. This is not true. After receiving this letter and in agreement with his above statement, I have repeatedly discussed the discrepancy in detail with H. Jarminowski and K. Kosfeld of Prof. Stieve's lab, both being responsible for continuing this experiment. We realized that they tried to reproduce the results using only old cuttlefish preparations lying on ice for more than 4 hours. As I have pointed out in my paper, freshness of the specimens is crucial for these experiments; already before leaving his team, I had demonstrated the age-depending differences and clarifying the methods to the co-workers. Prof. Stieve

must have been aware of this problem, since he financially supported my efforts to collect fresh material in 1993, after all my attempts to obtain reliable signals with old specimens had failed. From recent discussion with both above mentioned co-workers I understood that, different from Prof. Stieve's comment to my paper, the experiments have never been repeated with fresh probes.

3. According to the arguments above, it is clear that Prof. Stieve and his co-workers could not evoke signals by cGMP and cAMP which were different from those produced by buffer, due to unsuitable material. The existence of cN-gated cation channels is not only suggested by our findings but also by results published by e.g. Brown and Kaupp (1993), Nagy (1993) and Takagi (1994).

All final modifications of the manuscript were based on the suggestions of reviewers or Prof. Stieve's team, all of these suggestions made known to Prof. Stieve. He has never withdrawn his agreement to publication, but only explicitly his co-authorship.

### References

- Brown, J.E. and Kaupp, U.B. (1993) Soc. Neurosci., abstract 100.1, p. 229.
- Nagy, K. (1993) Neurosci. Lett. 152, 1-4.
- Takagi, M. (1994) J. Photochem. Photobiol. B: Biol. 23, 161-177.

### Berthold Huppertz

Institut für Anatomie, RWTH Aachen, Wendlingweg 2, D-52057 Aachen, Germany