

example of "Texas sharp shooting," where the shooter paints the bulls-eye around pre-existing bullet holes. The authors present mesothelioma rates in terms of "central and peripheral" locations, but they again fail to provide any specific information on the exact mine locations. (2) Gibbs categorized at most nine mines at Thetford Mines, and he did not classify them as central and peripheral, but McDonald *et al.* refer to 15 mines in another paper and 21 mines in still another. (14,2,9) Ten studies have based their conclusions on the central vs. peripheral distinction, but the 1995 letter to *Science* is the only publication which provides any foundation for this proposition. (1-10) Four other papers, all of which are co-authored by the McDonalds, erroneously cite Sebastián *et al.* (1989) and not the *Science* letter, as the source for the data on different tremolite levels, while five other papers failed to provide any basis for this conclusion. (1-5,6-10)

The assertion that the Thetford mines have varying tremolite contamination conflicts with other published data on this topic. McDonald *et al.* (1997) cite Sebastián (1989) and Gibbs (1979) as support for the central-peripheral theory. (2) However Gibbs, a McGill co-worker and co-author with McDonald of other papers concerning this inter-mine difference, published contrary and confusing information on this issue. (14) The number and locations of mines in question are anything but clear. None of the publications illustrate locations on a map, nor do they name the mines. Gibbs concluded that intra-mine non-malignant asbestos disease rates were larger than inter-mine differences and therefore differences in tremolite concentration, if they existed, could not explain differing disease rates. (14,15) He also noted that the mines were all part of the "same ore body" and there was no geological evidence showing any difference between mines in Thetford Mines. (14)