Years of Exposure Correction

In 1980, McDonald commented on the exposure data and noted, "Relative risks of lung cancer were considered in detail by Liddell et al. and it appeared that there was little to suggest that the way in which dust exposure had been accumulated played any part in determining the risk..It therefore seemed appropriate to base a second series of analyses on dust exposure accumulated to a certain age, arbitrarily taken as 45 years, at which age most men had completed their service. After the cohort had been divided by exposure to age *45*, two further, but separate, subdivisions were made by mining area (Asbestos and Thetford Mines) and by smoking habit; those whose smoking habit was unknown being added to the largest group—that is, moderate smokers. The study interval started at age 45." {Emphasis added] (McDonald et al. 1980a) Since this conclusion would reveal that the study was worthless, they "arbitrarily" divided the cohort into two groups by age and by geographic location. This allowed them to generate a linear dose-response graph for lung cancer and exposure.

Even after this supposed validation of the dose estimates the QAMA-McGill researchers unequivocally concluded that the dose estimates were worthless when Gibbs wrote, "thus it is clear that there is no single overall conversion factor that can be applied to the mining no data.(Gibbs 1994)