

16

April 18, 1975

Dr. George Roush, Jr.
Monsanto Company
800 North Lindbergh Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

Dear George:

I fully appreciate that the meeting on PCB's today was not completely satisfactory and that many nagging questions remain. The enclosed is a brief summary of my personal views and I would appreciate any open and frank comments that you all may have.

Please let me know of any action that you contemplate in the way of seeking additional assistance in pathology or in contacting federal agencies. We will be pleased to be of help in any way that you may wish.

It is my feeling that we need to get together again within the next few weeks to continue our discussions.

Very truly yours,

J. C. Calandra
President

JCC:AR

cc - Dr. George Levinskas
Mr. Elmer Wheeler
Mr. William Papageorge

REVIEW OF PCB MEETING

. . The central issue in question is whether the PCB's are carcinogens or not. The long term studies conducted at BIO-TEST indicate that the answer is no. Drs. Ward Richter and Donovan Gordon are of this opinion which is shared by M. L. Keplinger and J. C. Calandra.

On the other hand, a study conducted by Dr. Renata Kimbrough presents evidence that in female rats of the Sherman strain, liver carcinomas were found. This is the only study in which this finding is reported in rats. BIO-TEST has no basis for refuting the findings of Kimbrough except to take exception to the design of the experiment that used only female rats and to point out that to our knowledge no one else has reported similar results in rats. It should be noted that the earlier allegation by Kimbrough that bladder cancers developed in female rats fed PCB was successfully counteracted by BIO-TEST and Monsanto personnel.

Kimura¹ worked with Kanechlor-400, a commercial brand of PCB and in a rat study of 400 days' duration concluded that "PCB's induced a benign neoplastic change, though it seemed to be still short of malignancy, and that the change appeared exclusively in the females." The author expressed concern that the benign nodules in the liver may progress to carcinomas if "specific or non-specific stimuli are introduced into the animal."

Ito² conducted a study in mice and found "hyperplastic nodules and well-differentiated hepatocellular carcinomas" at a dose level of 500 ppm of Kanechlor 500. Hepatocellular carcinomas were not induced by Kanechlor 300 and Kanechlor 400.

The evidence to date indicates that male rats are more resistant than females to the formation of nodular hyperplasia as well as hepatocellular carcinoma. Rats also are more resistant to the induction of these lesions than mice.

To return to the BIO-TEST studies on PCB, it should be noted that the liver sections which were read by the pathologists and reported in IBT No. 641-06672 and dated March 24, 1975, were not the same slides or sections as those reported on originally. The preserved livers were reprocessed by taking 4 "cuts" from different areas to obtain as large a representative sample as possible. It is not surprising that under these circumstances a different tabulation of the various primary liver lesions was found. Studies on thyroid hyperplasia and by Richter's associate, Dr. Stanley Vesselinovitch, have shown that this procedure generally results in a different qualitative and quantitative line-up of lesions that are reported by the same pathologist.

Ideally one would like to be able to reaffirm the original findings by this procedure, but this is not always possible because of the additional variables introduced. Serial sections of the liver would

eliminate some of the covariants. The important point in the most recent study of the sections is the fact that no hepatocellular carcinomas were found which is in agreement with the earlier findings. It must be emphasized that the diagnosis of "hepatoma" by Gordon and Richter connotes a benign process and must not be confused with the classical definition of the term by "human" pathologists.

Further, Dr. Squires reviewed a number of the same slides on Aroclor 1260 with Drs. Gordon, Levinskas, Kimbrough and Richter and agreed with the BIO-TEST pathologists that liver carcinomas were not present in the slides. In addition, the original slides have been in the possession of FDA since June, 1973 and to date we have not been informed of any disagreement with BIO-TEST findings.

Dr. Squires has stated in a letter to Dr. Kimbrough dated November 12, 1974, that "I define 'discrete nodules' and 'trabecular (basophilic) hyperplasia' as precancerous lesions and thus indicative of carcinogenic response." This reflects a viewpoint which is not shared by all pathologists and there is nothing that BIO-TEST can do to change this definition except for its pathologists to accept or reject the view. Drs. Richter and Gordon do not accept Dr. Squire's definition.

Workers in the field have published extensively on the pathogenesis of hepatocellular carcinoma in recent years and the concepts have undergone considerable changes since the preparation

of the final BIO-TEST report on chronic oral toxicity studies. One must note that Popper³ in his studies on Aramite in 1960 postulated that hyperplastic nodules were transformed into hepatocellular cancer; however, this concept was not generally accepted by the scientific community.

An excellent paper which describes "the highlights of some newer developments in our understanding of liver carcinogenesis" has been published by Farber.⁴ If the concepts presented in this paper as well as those of Squires, Saffiotti and others are accepted, a number of substances would have to be reclassified as liver carcinogens. Carried to extreme, we could argue that any substance that results in stimulation of liver microsomal enzymes or possesses hepatocytotoxic properties to any degree is a potential liver carcinogen.

BIO-TEST is unwilling to accept these concepts. The lesions seen in the livers of the rats in its PCB studies for Monsanto do not show vascular invasion, metastases or anaplasia - all classical features of carcinoma. We continue to view the lesions seen to be benign.

Several additional things need to be done by BIO-TEST and these include:

- (a) Re-examine the original liver slides.
- (b) Cut new sections at different levels from original paraffin blocks and read slides.
- (c) Tabulate liver findings separately in female and male rats.
- (d) If possible, develop information on the reversibility of the liver changes.

It is important to point out the following:

1. The BIO-TEST position was and remains that the PCB's were not shown to be liver carcinogens in its studies. This conclusion is the opinion of its resident pathologists as well as its independent consultant.

2. The BIO-TEST results show that a no-effect level for the development of hyperplastic nodules was found in each of its studies.

3. BIO-TEST has no means at its disposal to dispute the findings of Kimbrough that Aroclor 1260 in female Sherman rats is a liver carcinogen except on the basis of experimental design.

4. BIO-TEST is not in agreement with the classification by Squires et al. that considers hyperplastic liver nodules to be pre-cancerous.

5. BIO-TEST studies on PCB's meet the scientific standards of Toxicology and Pathology and we are prepared to assist Monsanto in any adversary situation in or out of government.

J. C. Calandra

April 18, 1975

References

- 1 Kimura, N.T. Gann 64:105 (1973).
- 2 Ito, N. J. Nat. Cancer Inst. 51:1637 (1973).
- 3 Popper, H. Cancer 13:1035 (1960).
- 4 Farber, E. Arch. Path. 98:145 (1974).

Monsanto

Monsanto Company
800 N. Lindbergh Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63166
Phone: (314) 884-1000

July 18, 1975

Dr. J.C. Calandra
Industrial BIO-TEST Laboratories
1810 Frontage Rd.
Northbrook, Ill. 60062

re: AROCLOR 2-year Rat Feeding Studies

Dear Joe:

The attached table summarizes a comparison of the 3 revised AROCLOR reports (1242, 1254, 1260).

In 2 instances, the previous conclusion of "slightly tumorigenic" was changed to "does not appear to be carcinogenic". The latter phrase is preferable. May we request that the AROCLOR 1254 report be amended to say "does not appear to be carcinogenic".

The number of hepatomas reported for AROCLORS 1260 and 1242 have been interchanged. This appears to have arisen from confusion regarding the numbering of the animals. The original reports show tumors in animals with numbers in the 100-300 range for AROCLOR 1260 and in the 500 to 800 range for AROCLOR 1242. This leads me to conclude that the numbering scheme shown in the second set of reports is correct. With AROCLOR 1254 confusion is compounded. The original report showed tumors in animals with numbers in the units to teens, but the revised report shows animal numbers ranging from 40 to 1000. Can this be straightened out?

I was unable to reconcile the differences in the animal numbers between the first supplemental report and the original reports, I had inquired as to the changes in the numbers. As I recall, I was told that the sections had been renumbered when the new slides were made and that a key relating to the sets of numbers

100737

RECEIVED

JUL 21 1975 209

BIO TEST

ICC
MLK
DEG
(JAP)

Dr. J.C. Calandra
July 18, 1975
Page - 2 -

would be supplied. This has not been done. It may not be necessary for AROCLORS 1260 and 1242, but AROCLOR 1254 remains unresolved.

Insofar as I can see, the remainder of the reports appear acceptable.

Kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

George J. Levinskas, PhD
Mgr., Environmental Assessment
and Toxicology

/bkp

att.

cc: Dr. George Roush, Jr., M.D.

<u>Product</u>	<u>Supplemental Report #1 (mailed)</u>	<u>Supplemental Report #2 (JCC delivered)</u>
<u>AROCLOR 1260</u>		
conclusion	slightly tumorigenic	does not appear carcinogenic
hepatomas	3	7
range of test animal nos:		
p. 9	600 to 800	100 to 300
p. 10	1000 series	800 to 900
p. 11	70 to 100	10 to 40
p. 12	500 to 600	80 to 200
p. 13	600 to 700	200 to 300
p. 14	700 series	200 to 300
<u>AROCLOR 1254</u>		
conclusion	slightly tumorigenic	slightly tumorigenic
hepatomas	6	6
<u>AROCLOR 1242</u>		
conclusion	slightly tumorigenic	does not appear carcinogenic
hepatomas	7	3
range of test animal nos.	as in report #2 for AROCLOR 1260	as in report #1 AROCLOR 1260

August 4, 1975

Dr. George J. Levinskas, Manager
Environmental Assessment and Toxicology
Monsanto Company
800 North Lindbergh Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

Dear George:

Re: Aroclor - 2 Year Rat Studies

In regard to the comments and questions covered in your letter dated July 18, 1975, pertaining to the above, please note the following:

1. We will amend our statement in the last paragraph on page 2 of the Aroclor 1254 report to read, "does not appear to be carcinogenic" in place of "slightly tumorigenic" as requested.
2. In regard to the animal numbers in the Aroclor 1242 and 1260 reports, they are correct in our final revised report. In the original reports, the Aroclor titles for these two materials were reversed.
3. The animal identification numbers appearing in the reports on evaluation of additional liver sections are the same as those in our original report. The animals were not renumbered.
4. We cannot find any discrepancy in animal identification numbers in the reports (original, re-evaluation, final revision) on Aroclor 1254. However, in the report on re-evaluation of additional liver sections dated March 24, 1975, there was a typographical error on page 1 which referred to Aroclor 1260 instead of 1254. Perhaps this is the basis of your confusion.

I hope that this will serve to further clarify the situation. Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. Calandra
President

212

G 02138

100714