

350 / 1050

Statistical Research Unit,
London School of Hygiene
and Tropical Medicine
(University of London)
Keppel Street (Gower Street) W.C.1.
14th August 1953.

Dear Dr. Knox,

I received your letter a few days ago but I hope you will forgive me if I don't go into it in full, as I am just off on holiday and have had so many things to clear up before leaving. I can, however, make a number of comments now.

(1) The disparity between the numbers you first provided (76 men left and 53 still employed) and the present ones (52 left and 62 still employed) is not as great as appears at first sight. "Left" according to the first definition meant, I believe, "Left the Scheduled Areas" - we have, therefore to transfer the 16 men still working at T.B.A. but suspended from the Scheduled Areas from the still employed category to the left category, when the comparison becomes:

	<u>First estimate</u>	<u>Second estimate</u>
Left	76	$52 + 16 = 68$
Still employed	53	$62 - 16 = 46$

If you think that the second estimate is likely to have been more carefully carried out, I am quite ready to accept it and forget about the first estimate - though it must be realized that any deficiency in the estimated population must result in the actual risk of lung cancer being over-estimated. I am, however, rather worried by the second possibility you suggest - namely, that men may have left and died elsewhere or died in Rochdale without an autopsy. I can understand that the deaths of such men may have been missed but if the records of employment are adequate for our purpose the names of such men should appear in the list of "men employed in the scheduled areas, who have left T.B.A. and are presumed to be still alive" - at present a list of only 13 names.

(2) You say that W. Cavanagh, a man who had lung cancer at autopsy, was employed in the Maintenance Department - yet his name appears on the list as having worked for 29 years in the Scheduled Areas. How did his name come to get recorded there? Did it get there through the Personnel Manager's search of employment cards - i.e. as I presume all the other names got there - it is not fair to remove it because of special information you have obtained through interest in the cause of death, unless you make an equally intensive study of all the other men on the list.

(3) Presuming that the lists define the total population we are trying to study pretty fully, we can, I think, make something of the data. I suggest we make our calculations on the position as at 31.7.53 (a pity that the review was not made a month earlier, in the middle of the year, as the working would have been neater - but it is not important), and we should take no account of any deaths after that date. One necessary step will be to check that the 13 men recorded as having left T.B.A. but still alive were still alive on 31.7.53. Addresses are known for 12 of these men - could you possibly arrange for visits to be made to them?

(4) The data will be much more impressive if we can extend it to include men with 15 years service in the S.A. The numbers will then certainly be quite adequate for our purpose. I would suggest we forget about the 10-14 year exposure group, but that we tried to get information about the 15-19 year group.

(5) Can you let me know in detail what has been the Personnel Manager's method for the preparation of these lists of names? It would be a great help in deciding what credence we can give the results.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely, Richard Doll, M.D., M.R.C.P.

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT

TN 301

PERGAD-Bayonne.N.J.