

From: [Lu, Shan](#)
To: [Liu, Shan-Lu](#); [Su, Lishan](#)
Subject: RE: Emerging Microbes & Infections - TEMI-2020-0121 - changes required to your submission
Date: Sunday, February 16, 2020 12:56:04 PM

Evidence is too big and vague. Claims are those out there and our commentary addressed these specific claims. So we can defend.

From: Liu, Shan-Lu <liu.6244@osu.edu>
Sent: Sunday, February 16, 2020 12:53 PM
To: Lu, Shan <Shan.Lu@umassmed.edu>; Su, Lishan <lishan_su@med.unc.edu>
Subject: Re: Emerging Microbes & Infections - TEMI-2020-0121 - changes required to your submission

I am okay with the change for the title, but “claims” does not seem a good fit here –“evidence” is better I feel.

From: "Lu, Shan" <Shan.Lu@umassmed.edu>
Date: Sunday, February 16, 2020 at 12:51 PM
To: Shan-Lu Liu <liu.6244@osu.edu>, "Su, Lishan" <lishan_su@med.unc.edu>
Subject: RE: Emerging Microbes & Infections - TEMI-2020-0121 - changes required to your submission

Thanks, then let's not having those two parts.

On the title, I do not need to use “current”.

How about this:

No credible claims supporting the laboratory engineering of SARS-CoV-2

Shan

From: Liu, Shan-Lu <liu.6244@osu.edu>
Sent: Sunday, February 16, 2020 12:43 PM
To: Lu, Shan <Shan.Lu@umassmed.edu>; Su, Lishan <lishan_su@med.unc.edu>
Subject: Re: Emerging Microbes & Infections - TEMI-2020-0121 - changes required to your submission

Shan,

I agree to delete those two parts. One was added by me, based on Linda's email, and another was also by me, based on Ralph's comments.

From: "Su, Lishan" <lishan_su@med.unc.edu>

Date: Friday, February 21, 2020 at 1:40 PM

To: "Liu, Shan-Lu" <liu.6244@osu.edu>, "Weiss, Susan" <weissr@pennterms.upenn.edu>

Subject: Re: [External] Re: Your article proofs for review (ID# TEMI 1733440)

I have noticed that too, probably happened when we tried to simplify the chimeric virus paragraph, and I think Ralph had added the attenuation sentence relative to M15 in mice...

What was reported in the NM paper was that the SHC014-rMA15 chimeric virus was less pathogenic than M15, but more so than the chimeric M15 virus with the original Urbani Spike-gene in M15, probably due to one of the 6 mutations in the M15 S gene.

See old sentence:

Due to the elevated pathogenic activity of the SHC014-MA15 chimeric virus relative to the original human Urbani S-MA15 chimeric virus in mice, such experiments with SHC014- MA15 chimeric virus are considered as gain of function (GOF) studies...

I will try to fix this.

Thanks,

-Lishan

From: "Liu, Shan-Lu" <liu.6244@osu.edu>

Date: Friday, February 21, 2020 at 12:14 PM

To: "Weiss, Susan" <weissr@pennterms.upenn.edu>

Cc: "Su, Lishan" <lishan_su@med.unc.edu>

Subject: Re: [External] Re: Your article proofs for review (ID# TEMI 1733440)

Lishan: see below comments from Susan.

Susan: thank you. I had the same question before – Lishan, could you explain this?

Shan-Lu

From: "Weiss, Susan" <weissr@pennterms.upenn.edu>

Date: Friday, February 21, 2020 at 9:06 AM

To: Shan-Lu Liu <liu.6244@osu.edu>

Subject: Re: [External] Re: Your article proofs for review (ID# TEMI 1733440)