PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
TN 3022

72/2073-4

HCL/MW 26th July,1972

Dr.I.J.Selikoff, M.D.
Mount Sinai School of Medicine,
Fifth Avenue and 100th Street,
NEW YORK,
N.Y. 10029.

Dear Dr.Selikoff,

Thank you for your letter dated the 11th July,1972 requesting some reprints of my paper 'The Medical Surveillance of Asbestos Workers'. I have pleasure in enclosing two reprints herewith.

I do have tables translating the several figures but unfortunately I do not think they add very much in value to these figures. I enclose photo-stat copies herewith of the tables which are still in my possession. I am unable to find the table translating the radiological abnormalities in females and must apologise for this. When this paper was prepared I am afraid that a lot of the actual tabulation was done in rough and I have not preserved some of the information. In my opinion the data presented is only of value in that it gives an idea as to the type of work being undertaken but I do not think that it is of great statistical merit. The future proposal is to dove-tail my data on lung function and the Company's data on dust levels into the information being collected by the Department of Employment in their survey of asbestos workers.

I am also sending you a copy of the paper presented at Salford in May which again I do not think warrants very much attention. It was intended as a preliminary report which followed a full-day symposium on the value of lung function testing in order to estimate work capacity. As it was presented in conjunction with the British Association of Sports Medicine, it was largely biased in the use of lung function measures to predict work abilities within sports groups. The organisers felt that a paper which would indicate how lung function tests were being utilised in an industrial environment in order to screen employees and to observe changes in their lung function related to the nature of their employment,

/cont...

would be a useful conclusion to a symposium. For what it is worth I enclose the paper. I also attach to it the co-ordinates for the graphs showing the various parameters of lung function plotting against years of exposure.

When examining the smoking data, I must point out that I have not graduated the figures according to the amount smoked and a smoker is regarded as anybody who gives a history of currently indulging in the habit no matter how few cigarettes per day are consumed. I have pencilled in the regression equations for the graphs relating smoking to X-ray changes.

I hope that this information will be of some value to you and that you appreciate the inadequacies of both papers.

Kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

cc DHH/SH/TFK/BT S.

H.C.LEWINSOHN, M.B. B.Ch. D.I.H.
Chief Medical Officer.