MINUTES / miscell.

JNJ 000681548

Protected Document--Subject to Protective Order

1/17

Mr. G. Lee

In your memorandum of January 18 you take exception to reports in the Toiletries Bi-Monthly that "dusting had not been perceived to be reduced" and ~~you~~ you restate the objective of the PEG addition to JBP.

Attached are the pertinent sections of the Bi Monthly. It is clear that these reports refer to consumer perceptions of dustiness and merely suggest that consumers may not believe a less respirables story, if announced, since no reduced perception of dustiness pervades the data. The reports do not say that respirables have not been reduced nor allege that consumers are evaluating respirables nor are we equating dustiness with respirables.

The research was conducted to see if any major negatives in product performance would be noted in a home use situation and none are apparent. Questions pertaining to dusting were specifically asked because it is of interest to see if reducing the respirables also reduces the perception of dustiness.

Protected Document--Subject to Protective Order