J7300

Industrial BIO-TEST Laboratories, Inc.
1810 FRONTAGE ROAD
NORTHBROOK, ILLINOIS 60062

TOXICOLOGY
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
CHEMISTRY
PLANT SCIENCES
MEDICAL SCIENCES

AREA CODE 312
TELEPHONE 272-9030

088

PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION EXHIBIT
312
10-15-86 cy

624 N. Abrigo Drive
Green Valley, Az. 85614
Jan. 14, 1972

Dear Don:

I am returning the documents on egg quality criteria. These have not been very helpful in drafting the Drochon paper. This is not because the references are inappropriate but because they tend to confirm my notion that much of the data are either fudged or collected with carelessness or incompetence, particularly the data for the supplementary study with 1242.

1. The sp. g. for 7300 are generally lower than the cited normal values (by wells and by Ridlen). I suggest that you get copies of the papers checked at the end of the welch article. Baker and Curtin presumably relate physical characteristics to strain of chickens. I can probably get this paper at U. of Ariz. library. Check sp. g. of your brine solutions with a hydrometer just before each day of measurements.

2. Sp. g. is supposed to decrease with a decrease in eggshell thickness but in J8746 the sp. g. is higher and shell thickness is lower and remarkably constant.

3. It is difficult not to conclude that chick body weights at Day 1 are obviously

004394

STLCOPCB4030843

effected for same treatment groups and 30-day survival is generally lower for chicks from treated groups. In future studies do everything possible to maximize chick survival.

4. Absence of gross pathology for chicks in 8746 suggests to me that they were not examined.

My advice for future studies is the same as it would be for any study.

a. Do all things defined in the protocol
b. Do these carefully and report the data completely and honestly. c. use healthy chickens

I would not alter the protocol defined for 17300 but you might add observation for porphyria which has been described as an effect of PCB's in Chickens, quail and rats by Vos et al., Tox. appl. Pharmacol. 17, 656 (1970) and ibid. 22, 232 (1971).

I am ashamed to publish the work done in these studies. One must report the data but interpretation without conviction of reality. This is perhaps the most significant of the Aroclor studies and some of my conclusions are not in agreement with those of the reports (which I signed without detailed analysis) or with statements which have been made by Kep and by Monsanto in discussions with FDA and environmental groups. There's nothing like writing for publication to disclose defects.

Sincerely, 004395

Otis

STLCOPCB4030844