

February 4, 1970

P.S.I. Barry, M.D.
The Associated Octel Company Limited
Ellesmere Port, Cheshire L65 4HF
England

Dear Pat:

I am returning to you, herewith, the draft of your paper which came with your letter of January 7, and which I have edited fairly vigorously. I have done this without regard to the ordinary conventions of personal and professional courtesy, simply because I believe you would wish me to do this. You are at liberty, of course, to disregard any intrusions of mine into a deliberately chosen mode of linguistic expression, but I bring certain forms of speech to your attention, in case you find them beneficial rather than objectionable. One of the characteristics of your present style of writing has been adopted by you, or perhaps imposed upon you, inadvertently, by your American associations. American scientific writers, not entirely without exception, have been influenced by the press writers, also not wholly but mostly affected, who in an effort to achieve a "punch" and something different, have increasingly used forms of speech which, once, in a more conventional and, I believe, a gentler time, would have been condemned as indications of illiteracy. I refer to the stringing together of a series of nouns as adjectives limiting a remote - at the end of the string - principle noun. In your manuscript, a few of your worst examples are the following expressions: "bone lead concentrations," "Standard Man," "weight basis," "blood or urinary lead estimations." For some reason, the use of the ordinary prepositions "of, in and for" is considered passee, although those are among the most effective instruments of clear speech or language. This type of loose writing has probably resulted from your extensive reading of American toxicological reports, which, represent some of the most abominable, now almost conventional, linguistic offenses against good taste and good form ever to be found in the use of the English language. I warn you against them. Plain and direct (concise) speech in relatively simple language, and in conventional form, is much the best style of scientific writing.

I have suggested a few modifications of the substance of sentences, but there is little to quarrel with in the factual content of the manuscript. I have, for example, substituted "loss of lead" for "excretion of lead" in relation to the lead in hair and nails, for obvious reasons, and I have substituted "absorption of lead" for "exposure to lead" in one or two places, since they are by no means synonymous. It is, in fact, the concentration or quantity of lead in the body, or in specific tissues, which is concerned with the effects sustained; the severity of the exposure is never capable of being measured precisely except when a specific dose is administered by one method or another, and even then, the extent and quantity of the absorption is open to question. But I need not be pedantic.

Certain suggestions - which seem very rigid, when put on paper - relate to the requirements of the Archives, in matters of form. Your references, for example,

125 0003300

must be numbered, sequentially, in the paper, while the year need appear only in the reference itself, although direct note may be made of sequence in the manuscript when it is of immediate importance. Then also, your tables must be in accord with conventional form and must be numbered in Arabic numerals, while figures are designated by Roman numerals. I have written out the forms of references which are to be employed. These are matters of the format adopted by the Archives and kept uniform, as a matter of appearance. Your figures must be drawn in a manner suitable for reproduction by the printer, as original drawings (in your instance) of graphs, and the description (resembling that of a heading) should be such as to explain the graph fully (without reliance upon the text) in a legend which will be printed below the figure in the manuscript. The legend, in proper form, has the Roman numeral designation - which is not at the top of the graph - followed by the text. It should be on a separate sheet, unattached, but clipped to the drawing. I have made some modifications of the headings and legends as suggestions, but it is important (to the reader) that both the headings of tables and the legends of figures be sufficiently informative to carry their own message. The substance is indicated in the text, but the details of the structure of the graphic representations and the tabular arrangements must go into the legends of the figures and into the headings of the tables. You will have no trouble in setting these up properly, but the editor, or printer, will not do it for you, or permit it to be improper in form. Much time and trouble in correspondence will be saved by submitting a finished product as the manuscript.

If you want to send this to Katharine Boucot through me, I'll do what may appear, formally, to be required by her, before I forward it to her, while, at the same time, recommending it to her for publication. The acceptance will not be automatic because of my recommendation, but it will not be dubious because it is a good piece of work, well presented. Do not misunderstand me. The paper as you sent it to me is excellent. I have only attempted to improve it somewhat here and there.

I think this is all I need say at this time. I have scribbled (literally) notations on both tables and figures for whatever they may be worth to you in revising them.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

Bob/wp

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.
Professor Emeritus of
Occupational Medicine

RAK/wp

Dictated but not read

KE 0006321

REFERENCES

1. McCord CP: Lead and lead poisoning in early America: Benjamin Franklin and lead poisoning. *Industr Med Surg* 22:393-399, 1953.
2. Hunter D: The Diseases of Occupations. 2nd ed. London, English Universities Press, 1957, p 219.
3. Kehoe RA, Thamann F, and Cholak J: On the normal absorption and excretion of lead. I. Lead absorption and excretion in primitive life. *J Industr Hyg* 15:257-272, 1933.
4. Swiss Leaded Gasoline Commission: Report of the Swiss Leaded Gasoline Commission to the Federal Council on its activities during the period 1947-1960. *Mitt Geb Lebensmittelunters Hyg* 52:135-244, 1961.
5. Hofreuter DH, Catcott EJ, Keenan RG, et al: The public health significance of atmospheric lead. *Arch Environ Health* 3:568-574, 1961.
6. Waller RE, Commins BT, and Lawther PJ: Air pollution in a city street. *Brit J Industr Med* 22:128-138, 1965.
7. U.S. Public Health Service, Working Group on Lead Contamination: Survey of lead in the atmosphere of three urban communities. Publication 999-AP-12, Public Health Service, 1965.
8. Everett JL, Day CL, and Reynolds D: Comparative survey of lead at selected sites in the British Isles in relation to air pollution. *Food Cosmet Toxic* 5:29-35, 1967.
9. Patterson CC: Contaminated and natural lead environments of man. *Arch Environ Health* 11:344-360, 1965.
10. Danielsson L: Gasoline Containing Lead. Report for the Swedish Royal Commission on Natural Resources, Solna, Sweden, 1967.

KE 0006022

N 7718.01

11. Moncrief AA, Koumides OP, Clayton BE, et al: Lead poisoning in children. Arch Dis Child 39:1-13, 1964.
12. Hardy HL: Lead. Publication 1440, Public Health Service, 1966, pp 73-83.
13. Nusbaum RE, Butt EM, Gilmour TC, et al: Relation of air pollutants to trace metals in bone. Arch Environ Health 10:227-232, 1965.
14. Kehoe RA: The Harben Lectures, 1960. The metabolism of lead in man in health and disease. J Roy Inst Public Health 24:81-97, 101-120, 129-143, 177-203, 1961.
15. Kehoe RA: Industrial lead poisoning, in Patty FA: Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology, 2nd rev ed. New York, Interscience Publishers, 1963, pp 941-985.
16. Tompsett SL: The distribution of lead in human bones. Biochem J 30:345-346, 1936.
17. Allcroft R: Lead poisoning in cattle and sheep. Vet Rec 63:583-590, 1951.
- 18.
19. Schroeder HA, and Tipton IH: The human body burden of lead. Arch Environ Health 17:965-978, 1968.
20. Radošević Z, Saric M, Beritic T, et al: The kidney in lead poisoning. Brit J Industr Med 18:222-230, 1961.
21. Lane RE: Health control in inorganic lead industries. Arch Environ Health 8:243-250, 1964.