

COMMITTEE REPORTS

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL PHARMACEUTICAL NOMENCLATURE.

BY A. G. DUMÉZ, CHAIRMAN.

To the Members of the House of Delegates:

Your Committee on International Pharmaceutical Nomenclature has been inactive for the past year. This does not mean that the members have not been alert and willing to serve, but that the opportunity to participate in the development of a project in pharmaceutical nomenclature, international in scope, did not present itself. Such work as is being done along these lines at present is apparently being confined to the countries in which it is inaugurated and no attempt is being made to develop it in an international way.

Every now and then an international movement is begun to unify and improve the nomenclature in some fundamental branch of the sciences upon which the foundations of pharmacy rest, but toward which we have little or nothing to contribute, except our moral support. Such a movement was begun in the field of organic chemistry several years ago. The objective of the movement was to formulate a set of definitions and rules to govern the nomenclature of organic chemistry so that greater uniformity would prevail. A commission was appointed by the Council of the International Union of Chemistry to carry on this work. This commission rendered its first report in September 1930, and a second report in 1932. A translation of these reports from the French was made by Austin M. Patterson, and published in the *Journal of the American Chemical Society* last year.

The rules for nomenclature laid down in the above report will be followed by the Committee on Nomenclature of the United States Pharmacopœia, and no doubt also by the committees of revision of other national pharmacopœias, so that indirectly the work of the commission on Revision of the Nomenclature of Organic Chemistry will play a part in the unification of pharmaceutical nomenclature.

It would seem that, if this Association is sincerely interested in promoting greater uniformity in pharmaceutical nomenclature among the nations of the world, it will have to take the initiative in inaugurating the movement designed to accomplish this purpose. To be effective, however, any movement of this character will have to be financed and this is not a propitious time for financing new projects.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PHYSIOLOGICAL TESTING.*

Your Committee has continued the bioassay of Tincture of Digitalis, made for this purpose in 1928, by the U. S. P. X one-hour frog method, as well as by other recognized methods. The assay results indicate somewhat higher values this year than during the preceding year, and further studies are contemplated to determine whether these variations fall within the limits of experimental accuracy of the method. Detailed results are given in the accompanying tables.

During the coming year it is planned to continue these studies on the 1928 Tr. Digitalis stored in 5-gallon unopened containers, assaying it by several methods against: (1) ouabain; (2) a standard digitalis leaf; (3) a tincture prepared from (2) by the Chairman. Close coöperation is being maintained with other organizations engaged in digitalis bioassays from other viewpoints.

Some progress has been made during the year in compilation of a "Who's Who in Bioassays."

Clinical coöperation has been obtained and much time spent in completion of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION monograph upon "Aconitum." Clinical coöperation is now being sought for similar studies upon digitalis and its preparations.

The Committee has been requested to consider the suitability of various standards of reference in routine bioassays, and an attempt is to be made to collect information to serve as the basis of recommendations to the U. S. P. XI Revision Committee.

* Washington meeting, May 11, 1934.

TABLE I.—COÖPERATIVE ASSAYS OF A. PH. A. TR. DIGITALIS BY U. S. P. ONE-HOUR FROG METHOD: CORRECTED FOR STANDARD OUABAIN VALUES.

| Lab. No. | Date Assay. | Age Tr. Mos. | 1-Ounce Tincture "A." | | | 1-Ounce Tincture "B." | | |
|----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | Aa (Amber). | Ab (Blue). | Ac (Flint). | Ba. | Bb. | Bc. |
| 1 | July '29 | 5 | 6.5 | .. | .. | 8.0 | 8.2 | .. |
| | June '31 | 28 | 6.5 | 8.0 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 9.0 | 7.0 |
| | Mar. '33 | 49 | 4.5 | 6.5 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| | Apr. '34 | 62 | 4.5 | 6.5 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| 2 | July '29 | 5 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 6.4 | 6.4-7.2 |
| | Feb. '31 | 24 | 10.7-12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3-13.8 | 12.3 | 13.8 | 13.8-15.3 |
| | Oct. '31 | 32 | 13.3 | 11.7 | 15.0 | 16.7 | 13.3 | 20.0 |
| | May '32 | 39 | 8.6 | 9.3 | 6.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 7.5 |
| | Mar. '33 | 49 | 7.5 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 7.5 | 8.3 |
| | Feb. '34 | 60 | 10.0 | 7.2 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.7 | 5.0 |
| | May '29 | 3 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| | Aug. '29 | 6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 |
| 3 | Nov. '29 | 9 | 7.1 | 5.7 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 8.6 | 7.1 |
| | Feb. '30 | 12 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 6.7 | 7.0 | 8.6 | 8.3 |
| | Jan. '31 | 23 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 6.2 | 8.3 | 8.8 | 6.7 |
| | Feb. '31 | 24 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 7.3 | 7.7 | 7.9 |
| | Apr. '31 | 26 | 8.9 | 7.8 | 8.0 | .. | 8.0 | 10.0 |
| | Mar. '32 | 37 | 6.0 | 6.5 | .. | 4.5 | 6.5 | .. |
| | June '32 | 40 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 10.0 | 11.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| | Mar. '33 | 49 | 11.2 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 12.5 | 15.0 | 13.7 |
| | Oct. '33 | 56 | 11.1 | 10.0 | 11.1 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| | Jan. '34 | 59 | 11.8 | 13.1 | 12.0 | .. | .. | .. |
| 4 | Feb. '34 | 60 | 7.5 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 9.4 |
| | Feb. '31 | 24 | 6.0-7.5 | 6.0-7.5 | 6.0-7.5 | 9.2-10.9 | 9.2-10.9 | 9.2-10.9 |
| | Aug. '31 | 30 | 8.6-10.0 | 8.6-10.0 | 8.6-10.0 | 12.0-15.0 | 12.0-15.0 | 12.0-15.0 |
| | Mar. '32 | 37 | 10.0-12.0 | 10.0-12.0 | 10.0-12.0 | 20.0-30.0 | 20.0-30.0 | 20.0-30.0 |
| 5 | July '32 | 41 | 6.7-8.6 | 6.7-8.6 | 6.7-8.6 | 10.0-12.0 | 10.0-12.0 | 10.0-12.0 |
| | Jan. '31 | 23 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 4.4 | 5.6 |
| | Apr. '31 | 26 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 | .. | .. | .. |
| | June '32 | 40 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 11.9 |
| | Mar. '33 | 49 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 10.9 | 8.6 | 11.4 |
| | Mar. '34 | 61 | 9.0 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 11.0 | 9.0 | 11.0 |

TABLE II.—COÖPERATIVE ASSAYS OF A. PH. A. TR. DIGITALIS.

| Lab. No. | Method Assay. | Date Assay. | Age Tr. Mos. | 4-Ounce. | | 5-Gallon. |
|----------|---------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | Aa Cc./Kg. | Ba Cc./Kg. | Ac Cc./Kg. |
| 1 | 1-hr. frog | Apr. '34 | 62 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| 2 | 1-hr. frog | Feb. '34 | 60 | 6.4 | 5.7 | 5.0 |
| 3 | 1-hr. frog | Jan. '34 | 59 | 8.9 | 11.4 | .. |
| | | Feb. '34 | 60 | 7.5 | 8.1 | 8.0 |
| | M. L. D. guinea pig | Feb. '34 | 60 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 |
| | M. L. D. cat | Feb. '34 | 60 | ... | 0.5-0.7 | .. |
| 6 | Frog freq. curve | Feb. '34 | 60 | ... | .. | 13.4 |

TABLE III.—COÖPERATIVE ASSAYS OF A. PH. A. TR. DIGITALIS—1 Ounce.

| Lab. No. | Method Assay. | Date Assay. | Age Tr. Mos. | Tincture "A." | | | Tincture "B." | | |
|----------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|------|-----|---------------|------|---------|
| | | | | Aa. | Ab. | Ac. | Ba. | Bb. | Bc. |
| 1 | 4-hr. frog | July '29 | 5 | 9.0 | 8.3 | ... | 12.0 | 11.0 | ... |
| | | June '31 | 28 | 7.5 | 10.0 | 9.0 | 7.5 | 12.0 | 9.0 |
| | | May '33 | 51 | 6.5 | 8.5 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 8.5-9.0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 2 | M. L. D. frog | July '29 | 5 | 10.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 |
| | | July '30 | 17 | 15.0 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 18.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| | | Jan. '31 | 23 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| | | Oct. '31 | 32 | 15.0 | 18.0 | 15.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 6 | Frog freq. curve | Mar. '32 | 37 | 12.2 | 12.2 | 11.9 | 15.4 | 15.0 | 15.4 |
| | | July '32 | 41 | 11.5 | 12.9 | 12.4 | 13.4 | 14.4 | 13.3 |
| | | Mar. '33 | 49 | 12.2 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 14.4 | 14.2 |
| | | Feb. '34 | 60 | 13.2 | 12.8 | 11.2 | 14.5 | 15.6 | 12.8 |
| 3 | M. L. D. guinea pig | May '29 | 3 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| | | Aug. '29 | 6 | 5.0 | ... | ... | 6.0 | ... | ... |
| | | Feb. '31 | 24 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| | | Feb. '34 | 60 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| 5 | M. L. D. cat | Feb. '31 | 24 | 0.68 | 0.87 | 0.86 | 1.17 | 1.18 | 1.29 |
| 7 | Chem.* | Feb. '34 | 60 | 3.9 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 5.5 |
| | | p_H | Feb. '34 | 60 | 5.88 | 5.92 | 5.94 | 5.85 | 5.82 |

* Chemical assay by modified K-D method.

p_H by Wilson hydrogen electrode method: checked against U. S. P. Standard Tincture and recalculated to standard of 6.0 cc.

TABLE IV.—CHANGE IN A. PH. A. TR. DIGITALIS ON AGING: ONE-HOUR FROG ASSAY. AVERAGE DATA FROM ALL LABORATORIES AS PER CENT U. S. P. STANDARD.

| Age Mos. | 1-Ounce. | | | 4-Ounce. | | | 5-Gallon. |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | A % U. S. P. | B % U. S. P. | B as % of A. | A % U. S. P. | B % U. S. P. | B as % of A. | A % U. S. P. |
| 0 | ... | .. | 80 | ... | .. | 80 | ... |
| 3 | 143 | 97 | 68 | 143 | 97 | 68 | ... |
| 6 | 98 | 91 | 92 | ... | .. | .. | 143 |
| 9 | 94 | 85 | 90 | ... | .. | .. | ... |
| 12 | 102 | 75 | 74 | ... | .. | .. | ... |
| 24 | 87 | 67 | 78 | ... | .. | .. | ... |
| 30 | 61 | 48 | 79 | ... | .. | .. | ... |
| 36 | 72 | 47 | 66 | ... | .. | .. | ... |
| 42 | 65 | 51 | 79 | ... | .. | .. | .. |
| 48 | 73 | 61 | 84 | ... | .. | .. | ... |
| 60 | 67 | 65 | 98 | 85 | 77 | 91 | 95 |

(Signed) L. W. ROWE,
E. E. SWANSON,
JAMES C. MUNCH, *Chairman.*

THRIFTY DRUG STORES (CALIFORNIA) ORDERED TO SURRENDER BLUE EAGLE.

The Thrifty Drug Stores, a California chain with headquarters in Los Angeles, was ordered by NRA to surrender its Blue Eagles, for violation of the trade practice provisions of the retail drug code.

The case has been referred to the Litigation Division, with the request that suit be filed to obtain an injunction restraining further violation.

According to press reports this order was made non-effective by a court action. Com-

pliance with codes depends on confidence in the officials and in assurance that no partiality is shown in enforcing them.

BUSINESS SUBSIDIES UNDER NRA.

It is not right to say that business has received no Government subsidy. Yet relatively a small percentage of those who went under the codes and volunteered to shorten hours and increase pay-rolls were Government beneficiaries. They put up the additional money needed out of their own reserves, and if reserves had already been exhausted they borrowed from private sources.