

DISCUSSION

DR. deTREVILLE: It might also be of interest to add at this point that, according to Dr. Utidjian, there was no history of bronchitis (cough and sputum) in any non-smoker in the individuals identified as "positives", so these findings are consistent with the recognized relationship between smoking and bronchitis.

DR. THOMAS F. MANCUSO (University of Pittsburgh): I should like to caution you in regard to your interpretation of the presumably negative findings and to remind everyone, if I understand the study properly, that this was an x-ray study of a population at a given point in time, which represented a cross-section of the population working at that point in time; and, therefore, represents what we call a survivor group. It is really a selective group—those individuals who are healthy enough to work. It does not include individuals who have been employed many years prior to that time, who have left because of illness. We find this is very true in industry that over various points in time, depending upon the economic conditions or production and so forth, that there is remarkable variability in the individuals who are sick, who leave, either of their own accord or in relationship to some policy. So, I do not think really that this particular study, other than providing you with some particular type of lead for your own purposes, should have much attention given to it; and I would not add the additional refinements that you are doing to it, because basically it is a survivor population. I am interested, however, in the comment in regard to what Dr. Wright did, as I am not acquainted with that particular study. But if his x-ray study which you referred to, again was a cross-sectional study of the population, then we are in the same situation. If, however, he has combined this type of study with, say x-rays from pre-employment examinations at a given point in time, say 1945 versus examinations 20 years later, 5, 10, 15, 20 years later, then he had a longitudinal progressive change of x-ray. In such a study you are more apt to be on safer ground, provided, of course, that the x-ray measurements were done the same way, the film was processed the same way, etc. On the face of it, therefore, I cannot see that the Industrial Hygiene Foundation study, as conceived and reported here, will add anything to Dr. Wright's study.

DR. E. A. GAENSLER (Boston University School of Medicine): I don't quite understand: First you said that you had 33 "abnormal" x-rays of the 226. Then you said all of these had been read by a radiologist and had been considered as "normal." Then you said that this was not the sort of thing that would prevent any individual from being employed in the pre-employment examination, and then you refer to "micro-nodulation." Well, it seems to me there needs to be better definition.