Perhaps Lishan can take a look at the latest version, which has the new title I suggested, and modify it as needed.

The last paragraph is also crucial, but I did not have time to work on it because of a meeting this morning.

Once we have almost a final draft, I will contact Linda Saif, Stanley Perlman, Thomas Gallgaher etc. to see if they are willing to join, but this may delay the publishing time.

SL

From: "Su, Lishan" < lishan_su@med.unc.edu
Date: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 at 1:52 PM

To: "Lu, Shan" <<u>Shan.Lu@umassmed.edu</u>>, Shan-Lu Liu <<u>liu.6244@osu.edu</u>>

Subject: Re: 2019-nCoV-EMI commentary

I agree that it should be simple and clear. I have included some details in the 1st draft for your information. There is not intention to defend Baric, but to clarify the facts.

Regarding all three, are you combining Goa Feng's piece with this one? For the RaTG13, it involves complicated viral evolution kinetics and maybe hard to simply clarify...

Best,

-Lishan

From: "Lu, Shan" < Shan.Lu@umassmed.edu > Date: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 at 1:44 PM

To: "Su, Lishan" |iu, Shan-Lu" |iu.6244@osu.edu

Subject: RE: 2019-nCoV-EMI commentary

Sorry here is the attachment with tracking

From: Lu, Shan

Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 1:44 PM

To: 'Su, Lishan' < liu.6244@osu.edu>

Subject: RE: 2019-nCoV-EMI_commentary

Hi, I am adding Shuying from my group. She just read the last draft from Lishan and identified a few errors (with tracking).

Also I just had a phone call with SSL and we agreed on the following:

- 1. We need to make this commentary very simple and short;
- 2. It is better not going to too much science/tech details as it can only confuse people and

provide more room for people to raise more questions;

- 3. We don't want to appear that we are defending Ralph even though he did nothing wrong.
- 4. We feel it is best to cover 3 issues in this commentary (for the above reason, plus it is more powerful to cover multiple issues in one summary)
- 5. ??

SLL: please add anything I missed.

Shan

From: Su, Lishan < lishan su@med.unc.edu> Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 12:52 PM

To: Lu, Shan <<u>Shan.Lu@umassmed.edu</u>>; Liu, Shan-Lu <<u>liu.6244@osu.edu</u>>

Subject: Re: 2019-nCoV-EMI_commentary

Thanks. Looking at Shanlu's version, we may need a separate for the RaTG13 vs lab accident theory...

-Lishan

From: "Lu, Shan" < Shan.Lu@umassmed.edu>
Date: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 at 12:44 PM

To: "Liu, Shan-Lu" < "Su, Lishan" < "lishan_su@med.unc.edu">"lishan_su@med.unc.edu">"su, Lishan"

Subject: RE: 2019-nCoV-EMI_commentary

Here is my new version based on SLL's. highlighted areas are my new version (I did not leave tracking as it is too messy). Please take a look then we can focus on the chimeric one which needs more simplification as I can see. We may not need to go too deep in science as it can only confuse more people and found more issues from those who has suspicion.

Shan

From: Liu, Shan-Lu < <u>liu.6244@osu.edu</u>>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 11:22 AM

To: Lu, Shan <<u>Shan.Lu@umassmed.edu</u>>; Su, Lishan <<u>lishan_su@med.unc.edu</u>>

Cc: Liu, Shan-Lu < liu.6244@osu.edu > **Subject:** 2019-nCoV-EMI_commentary

<u>LIU.6244@OSU.EDU</u> appears similar to someone who previously sent you email, but may not be that person. <u>Learn why this could be a risk</u>

Feedback

Thanks.