



STANDARD OIL COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA

August 17, 1962

L. E. CURTIS, M. D.
MEDICAL DIRECTOR

JAMES RYAN, M. D.
ASSISTANT MEDICAL DIRECTOR
225 BUSH STREET
SAN FRANCISCO 20, CALIFORNIA

RICHARD DILLON, M. D.
REGIONAL PHYSICIAN
605 WEST OLYMPIC BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES 54, CALIFORNIA

METHYL STUDY 131.31

Robert A. Kehoe, M. D.
The Kettering Laboratory
College of Medicine - Eden Avenue
Cincinnati 19, Ohio

Attention: Frank Princi, M. D.

Dear Bob:

We have just received from Dr. Princi copies of the Part 1 and Part 2 of the Tetramethyl Study and, since there have been several changes in the text of the Part 2 from the text you submitted earlier, our comments will be on the one forwarded by Dr. Princi. Incidentally, I notice that, in connection with his copy, the credits have been deleted and he does not use the method for the determination of lead in material collected on millipore filters.

Insofar as credits are concerned, this always presents a problem to decide at what point one should cease mentioning names. Personally, I would be satisfied to see the credits for investigative work given in a blanket way to the "Many Employees of the Companies Involved Who Contributed to the Study." If, however, you wish to give individual credits, then I believe Mr. John F. Koehnle of Ethyl Corporation and Dr. Lawrence A. Gerlach of DuPont should be included in these credits.

Now to the specific comments on the paper as forwarded by Dr. Princi:

Page 3, Line 5. Some of our people feel this is a confusing statement: "The rate of absorption of tetramethyl lead can not be estimated by determinations of lead in the blood (true) but rather is best revealed by the measurement of the lead in the urine." Strictly speaking, the measurement of lead in the urine does not measure absorption but measures excretion.

Page 4, Line 10. We suggest the wording "All of the men (five) engaged in the mixing operation in one of the refineries were investigated."

KE 0007009

N9584

Robert A. Kehoe, M. D., #2

August 17, 1962

Page 5, Paragraph 3, Line 3. "Critical observation prolonged exposure to the vapor of gasoline....." We believe this statement is inaccurate inasmuch as the men were not subjected to either severe or prolonged exposure. It is possible that there would be a short-term severe exposure, but prolonged exposure is practically an impossibility with the facilities arranged as they are. Perhaps it would be better to state that the possibility of such exposures existed.

Page 6, Line 4. "Only a few men were subjected to such exposure." Again, the wording implies exposure where none existed. We suggest substituting "possibility" for "exposure" at the end of the sentence.

Page 16, Line 1. "The application of the two methods to duplicate samples." This is not clear as to whether or not the two methods were applied to each of the two duplicate samples or whether one method was applied to one and the other method applied to the other.

Page 17, Table 1. Although it is perfectly legitimate to list all ranges above 5.0 as you have done, it is conceivable that someone might be critical in reading the article of the fact that such a large number (17 out of 59) fall above the mean, and were not included in the table. This is not a major fault in my opinion but simply a warning that someone might criticize severely.

Page 55, Paragraph (a), Line 8. "The average levels of concentration....." including the rest of that paragraph. We are unable to correlate the figures in Table 1 and Table 2 with the figures you have given and wonder if perhaps these should not be re-examined.

Otherwise, we feel both of these are excellent reports and are returning them herewith.

Sincerely yours,



L. E. CURTIS, M. D.

LEC:mr

Enclosures

KE 0007010