UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES MEDICAL JOURNAL
2300 E STREET, N. W. • WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

8 August 1960

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.
Department of Preventive Medicine & Industrial Health
The Kettering Laboratory
University of Cincinnati College of Medicine
Cincinnati 19, Ohio

Dear Dr. Kehoe:

Thank you for your letter of 3 August 1960 appraising the article, "Outbreak of Lead Poisoning Caused by Tetracthyl Lead," by Captain Schlang, which had been submitted for publication in the U. S. Armed Forces Medical Journal.

On behalf of the editors, I wish to express my appreciation for your assistance in reviewing this manuscript.

Sincerely,

MAY SHERMAN, M.D.
Associate Editor

/mg

N 6310

August 3, 1960

xxxxxxxx
Avon 1-2568

May Sherman, M.D.
Editorial Office
United States Armed Forces Medical Journal
2300 E Street, N.W.
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Doctor Sherman:

I regret that I have been so long in getting to the examination of Captain Schlang's paper on Tetraethyl Lead Poisoning. Unfortunately, the Thirteenth International Congress on Industrial Health in New York came on the heels of my return from a mission abroad, and there has been no time until now to look the paper over.

This paper may well be published, I believe, in order to acquaint others with the significance of the exposure to leaded gasoline which gave the results described in this paper. It should be modified, however, in my opinion, to do just this. As a report of cases it is satisfactory and useful. As a discussion of the problem or series of problems associated with the general distribution and use of gasoline containing tetraethyl lead, it leaves very much to be desired. Moreover, the handling of the diagnostic aspects of tetraethyl lead poisoning is not clear because the author confuses a number of the facts and issues of these cases with those associated with poisoning induced by the inorganic compounds of lead. He initiates this at the outset by his title which should be "An Outbreak of Tetraethyl Lead Poisoning." There are certain things in common in the two sets of conditions, but the important point is really that tetraethyl lead poisoning differs significantly from inorganic lead poisoning at almost every important point, because of the nature of the distribution and ultimate fate of tetraethyl lead in the body. Captain Schlang either does not know this, or he does not realize its importance in diagnosis, prognosis and therapy.

I need not go into the details at this point, but rather illustrate my points by specific examples:

1. Dr. Schlang should not have attempted to discuss the hazards associated with the use of tetraethyl lead (page 1) without separating them completely from occupational lead poisoning in general. It is true that the tetraethyl lead industry has controlled the exposure to this compound, but the implication that exposure to lead in industry generally

been controlled, is very far from being true. Lead poisoning is the most frequent disease in American industry.

The general discussion of tetraethyl lead poisoning has been done better elsewhere. Captain Schlang should describe has own cases, which do not cover the entire field, and let it go at that, instead of assuming to cover the subject.

3. The discussion of the diagnosis is not satisfactory, especially on page 11, in which many irrelevant statements are made. The effect of this discussion is confusing, and virtually all of page 11 should be deleted. Since the level of lead concentration in the blood does not increase in any relation to the absorption of tetraethyl lead (as it does so nicely in association with the absorption of inorganic lead), the statements about the lead in the blood are confusing.

Likewise the statements about "stippling" which never occurs in response to the absorption of tetraethyl lead, as well as much of the remainder of the discussion on page 12 does not contribute to clarity. Again Captain Schlang does not realize the difference between tetraethyl lead poisoning and inorganic lead poisoning, from the physiologic and diagnostic viewpoints.

So much for my criticism, at this time, I repeat that this article should be published after it has been limited to the simple function of case reporting.

I trust that my criticisms will not seem to be unduly harsh. I do not mean them to be so. Captain Schlang is to be congratulated on his effort to publicize this situation. It is only inevitable that he would fail to visualize this entire problem which has been under examination for thirty odd years without being fully reported. He should not attempt the impossible, but should simply report his observations.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.

RAK ef

Enc.

KE 0002441

ing is

July 5, 1960'

Dr. May Sherman
U. S. Armed Forces Medical Journal
2300 E Street, N.W.
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Doctor Sherman:

Your request for criticism of Captain Henry A. Schlang"s arti[illegible] k of Lead " by Dr. Robert A. om the country. ttention when he returns on July 14th.

Very truly yours,

rms

N 6310.02

UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES MEDICAL JOURNAL
2300 E STREET, N. W. • WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

29 June 1960

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.
Department of Preventive Medicine & Industrial Health
The Kettering Laboratory
University of Cincinnati College of Medicine
Cincinnati 19, Ohio

Dear Dr. Kehoe:

Because of your contributions to the medical services of the Department of Defense and your special knowledge in the field involved, an appraisal of the suitability of the following article which has been submitted for possible publication in the U.S. Armed Forces Medical Journal will be appreciated:

"Outbreak of Lead Poisoning Caused by Tetraethyl Lead" by Captain Henry A. Schlang.

Your frank criticism is invited to include reasons why you consider that the article is suitable for publication after routine editing, is unsuitable in whole or in part, or might be acceptable after proper revision. It would be of particular interest to know your opinion as to the significance and timeliness of the subject and the technical accuracy of the article.

Please do not fold, edit, or make marginal notes on the manuscript. Your name will not be used in any correspondence with the author. A self-addressed envelope, requiring no postage, is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your continued interest in our publication.

Sincerely,

Riley Sherman, M.D.
THE EDITORS

2 Encls
1. Manuscript
2. Return Envelope