



Dr. J.C. Calandra (9-71)

re: AROCLOR 1260

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 AROCLOR 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 600 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

MONS 096076

Wm J. C. Calandra
May 18, 1975
Page - 2 -

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

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

Kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

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

Jag

att.

and Dr. George Roush, Jr., M.D.