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About the Cover
The cover features a 3-dimensional graph of the distribution of the sizes of particles of polyphenon E (Poly E), a mixture of epigallocatechin 3-gallate (EGCG) and at least four other catechins found in green tea. Poly E is the form of green tea commonly used in clinical trials. The particle sizes of Poly E (blue bars) and Poly E stripped of EGCG, or Poly E-light (gray bars), are virtually the same, with a geometric median diameter of 0.13 μm and geometric standard deviation of 1.6 μm. The 0.13 μm diameter of Poly E is many times smaller than any other reported to date, optimizing its aerosolized delivery to and absorption by lung tissue. As reported in this issue of the journal, aerosolized Poly E was more effective than was aerosolized Poly E-light (or EGCG alone) in reducing tumor multiplicity in a model of chemically induced mouse-lung tumorigenesis. The difference in efficacy between Poly E and Poly E-light most likely was due to differences in biological, not physical, properties since the particle sizes of the two compounds were similar. See articles by Fu et al. (beginning on page 531) and Bode and Dong (beginning on page 514) for more information.