



THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY

MIDLAND, MICHIGAN 48674

June 24, 1987

TO: R. Egedahl, M.D.

FROM: G. W. Olsen *Neay*

SUBJECT: GENERAL MORTALITY STUDY OF DOW CHEMICAL CANADA INC.,
SARNIA DIVISION

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

DOW-1303

Enclosed is my second round of comments with them incorporated into a new draft. I have also enclosed the disc for your secretary's use as well as the draft you sent me to review (with my comments written on this draft).

A few things I would like to bring to your attention in this letter. First, are you getting the SMR values based on using the Ontario general population as a comparison? I thought you said you were, and if so that is great. I think a second comparison population would be an excellent addition to the paper. Secondly, in the second paragraph on page 2 I have asked you to state how complete was your independent check of the completeness of the study cohort. You state that it was done but I don't know what the findings were. Third, in the discussion paragraph regarding restrictive cigarette smoking policy, I have added a reference in which the authors alluded to the same fact. I am wondering whether you can elaborate a little more on how restrictive the policy was, when was it instituted, etc.

The fourth point has to do with the discussion paragraph concerning the mesothelioma cases. The description of the mesothelioma cases that you wrote stated what their work histories (briefly) were. There was no indication that asbestos exposure was possible/likely and in fact the way the work histories are

ST0164540

R. Egedahl, M.D.

-2-

June 24, 1987

described, it may have the appearance to our critics that we are saying asbestos exposure was unlikely. I think we need either to be more elaborate in our description of these three individuals and point out where potential asbestos exposure may have taken place or simply state (as I did in the draft I returned to you) that we are investigating the three cases' potential workplace asbestos exposures. Either way is probably better than the way it was stated in the draft you sent me. I personally think more elaboration on our part is a better way to go than just stating "we are investigating". Therefore, if you can discuss further the potential areas that asbestos exposure may have occurred in these three individuals, that would certainly be acceptable to me; however, I'm not sure whether a more in-dept discussion would exacerbate any of your concerns. Let me know what you think. Hope my comments are helpful to you.

aaq

STO164541