

March 20, 1970

Professor J. Teisinger
Institute of Industrial Hygiene
and Occupational Diseases
Srobarova 48
Prague, Czechlovakia

Dear Teisinger:

The papers presented at the Conference in Amsterdam were forwarded to me some time ago, on the basis of our understanding at the time of the Conference, that I was to submit them to the Editor of the Archives of Environmental Health, along with a summary of the proceedings of the Conference prepared by Malcolm and his British colleagues. I was instructed also to give such assistance as I could, to the Editor, in having these papers shaped up to accord with the requirements of the Archives as to matters of form and some degree of conformity with linguistic usage.

It was necessary, first, to submit the entire set of papers and the summary to Dr. Boucot, the Chief Editor, for such examination and comment by her editorial board as might be made with reference to the acceptability of the individual manuscripts or what might be necessary to make them so (in matters of form). This was done while I was in Japan at the International Congress, and on my return (I went also to Australia) the entire bundle of material, comments and all were returned to me, Dr. Boucot having requested me to act as "guest editor." I have been working to that end for the past two months, and am making reasonably good progress. I believe the proceedings of the Conference will make a good international document in which we can have some satisfaction.

Some of the papers, your own included, have had to be revised somewhat, editorially, in view of the fact that they will be distributed (as a special number of the Archives) to an audience which will not be limited to persons familiar with occupational medical problems. In your case, I have thought it necessary to my own comfort of mind, to send my initial draft of your article to you for examination. I have added a few points in the discussion, with the idea of clarifying certain matters which, in my own opinion, would not be clear to some of our colleagues who have not been deeply involved in these matters. I've attempted to do this without altering your views as I understand them. I hope I have succeeded. It has been necessary to avoid expanding the scope and length of the article, for there is a limitation in the size of this special number of the Archives.

I must also have the answers to a few questions. I do not have at hand at the moment, the street address of your Institute. No doubt I can find it, but it will be easier for me if you will let me have it.

I need also to know the precise composition of the chelating agent which you employ. I would suppose that it is the sodium, calcium salt of EDTA, but since you speak of it as Ca EDTA, I am not so sure.

KE 0019388

March 20, 1970

The copy of my draft of your paper is deliberately unfinished, in order to enable you to make such alterations as you believe to be necessary. I would suggest, in all respect and courtesy, that you make few and simple changes as far as possible, that is, only those which are really essential. I do not wish to put words in your mouth, other than those which leave your meaning unchanged. I must, however, put all of the papers into a fairly uniform style. I am sure you know that this is by no means easy, and so I ask your indulgence.

Please get this back to me as soon as possible, for much time has elapsed already in getting this material into print. It is obvious that I cannot return all of the papers to their authors for examination, and in most instances, it is not necessary nor useful to do so. I repeat, however, that I wish to make very sure (since I have added some ideas which were only inferred) that I have not misspoken you.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.
Professor Emeritus of
Occupational Medicine

RAK:wp

enclosure as stated

P.S. Please let me have the title and degree which you will want me to use.

RAK

KE 0019389

July 19, 1971

To: Mr & Marguerite T. Zimmerman (Copy Editor)

From: Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.

Re: "The Interrelationship of Biochemical Responses to Lead Absorption"
M.S. 306 (Sym. #10) R.L. Zielhuis, M.D.

1. The title is wholly acceptable as it is, but it has one fault, which in view of the current, very great interest in lead antiknock compounds in gasoline, is of some importance. The omission of "Inorganic" which was in the original title, is the matter at issue. I do not consider it to be of more than passing importance, but at the moment it is. If you decide to introduce "inorganic" into the title, I would suggest the following; "Interrelationship of Biochemical Response to the Absorption of Inorganic Lead." It will fit into your specification, and it is better, in my view, than the author's version which ends with the phrase, "in Inorganic Lead Absorption".
 2. I have no way of determining Dr. Zielhuis' first name. He has always signed it in his correspondence with me, which extends over a period of years, as "R.L. Zielhuis". This note has appeared on almost every memo of the copy editors, including the Chief I can, if it is so urgently desired, write to the persons concerned, with only a few whom I have been sufficiently well acquainted or closely associated, to know their first names, and obtain the first names, probably after some delay. Please let me know or ask Miss Melanga to do so. I'm willing to do my best, but frankly, I prefer the author's custom, as a matter of courtesy, rather than the strict convention of A.M.A. form. simply "makes no sense" to me.
 3. This alteration is all right with me. It is not the way with which I am familiar, but it is certainly advisable to adhere to this matter of style in publishing.
 4. I'm sorry about the references. I understand, of course, and have for a long time understood, the manner of numbering, and the sequence of listing, employed in the Archives. I simply failed to notice the different sequence employed by Dr. Zielhuis, because of the failure of the appearance of references in the text. I regret that you were given such trouble.
 5. The full text of Reference 21 and Reference 22 are given below:
21. Prophylaktische orale Verabreichung von Ca_2EDTA (Mosatil-Bayer) bei Arbeitern, welche einer Vergiftung mit Blei ausgesetzt sind. I. Verabreichung von 2 g Ca_2EDTA pro Tag. * *See later note on last page. RAK*
22. Prophylaktische orale Verabreichung von Mosatil bei bleigefährdeten Arbeitern. II. Verabreichung mit 1- und 3-g-Mosatil-Tabletten pro Tag.
- You will note that the formula given for the compound in #21 is Ca_2EDTA . I think there is little doubt that the compound referred to was Na_2CaEDTA , for it is common to find both of these in the same article in a number of instances. I say this despite the use of Ca_2 rather than Na_2C , as though the author was being chemically wise, instead of simply careless. However, you can handle the matter as you choose, for there is such a compound as Ca_2EDTA .
6. I give you herewith the correct reference #42. I regret that the year was given incorrectly. The Volume, as you can see, was correct.
 42. Fautrel M: Exploitation statistique de données biologiques sur le pré-saturnisme clinique professionnel. Arch Mal Prof 19:5-20, 1958.

7. As for reference #58, we can do nothing except, perhaps, to write to Dr. Teisinger for information. This, again, is one of those privately printed reports, distributed subsequently only to the participants in, and the originators of, the Conference or Symposium. Let me know if this should be done.

8. The articles noted by Dr. Zielhuis in his references (now listed as your references 71, 72, 74 and 91) were read (or presented) at the Amsterdam Conference, but for one or another reason (no manuscript provided, or information published elsewhere, or paper rejected) were unacceptable for publication. It would be best, it seems to me, to delete them, entirely, but because Zielhuis has inserted them into his manuscript at some point, you may decide that they should not be deleted. I give you, therefore, the titles under which they were read, so that inquiring readers can follow some course (correspondence or resort to another paper) in consulting these persons.

Reference 71 - King, E: Read before the Conference on inorganic lead, Amsterdam, 1968. The article so read consisted of a series of data from both published and unpublished observations, with discussion (which were enlarged upon verbally). This paper, with Dr. King's full approval, was not published in the series of papers. The title was "Inorganic Lead - Biochemical Relations. The sites of the publications of these data in the literature at that time, or since, have not been stated, and if they had been stated, they would not be especially helpful at this time.

Reference 72 - Cramér, K. and Selander, S.: entitled "Relationships between the concentration of lead in blood and delta-aminolevulinic acid (ALA) in urine during lead-exposed work." This paper was not published for the reason that the article had been published in full in 1970. Cramér, whom I know very well, sent a reprint to me, in answer to a question which I put to him, and this caused me to reject completely the paper which he had presented at the Conference. I so informed him. If you wish to change to the documented reference, the following is the information on the published article, as it actually appeared: Stig Selander and Kim Cramér. Interrelationships between lead in blood, lead in urine, and ALA in urine, during lead work. British Journal of Industrial Medicine, Volume 27, Page 28, 1970, (the actual pages are 23-29, inclusive).

Reference 74 - Stopps, G.J., who presented certain data which either are, or are to be, published elsewhere, and discussed their significance. Several persons presented items or collections of data of this type, myself included, and no formally written paper. All of such fragmentary but pertinent presentations, were denied further publications in the Archives. Stopps' paper, which is little more than a memorandum with explanations, is entitled, "Relationships of Urine Lead Levels to Urine Delta-aminolevulinic Acid Levels in Persons Exposed to Inorganic Lead."

Reference 91 - Lehnert, G., is entitled "Lead Intoxication - A cybernetic problem." This was a full-fledged paper which was regarded by Archives reviewers as requiring much shortening and revision. I simply would not (actually could not) rewrite this article, since it is, in part, in a mathematical area in which I am lost. I rejected it, therefore, and recommended to the author that he have it published elsewhere. It may have been an excellent article, but it was irrelevant to the purposes of this Conference, and in my view, was unsuitable for the Archives. I wrote a courteous letter explaining the situation frankly, and I hope Lehnert finds a publisher elsewhere. If I had had at hand my (mathematical) biometrist colleague (who had moved elsewhere), I might have tried to rewrite the article with his help, but otherwise there was no possibility of my doing so. Perhaps, this man is a thoroughly competent man (judging from his connections), whose article is far ahead of the professional parade, but I am not competent to judge.

KE 0019391

9. Reference 81 concerns itself with an educational effort made in England, and published in the Annals of Occupational Hygiene, as indicated. On the 7th and 8th of April 1964, the 16th Conference of the British Occupational Hygiene Society (a quite small society) met in the Nuffield Department of Occupational Health in the University of Manchester to hear lectures by Ronald Lane, Head of the Department of Occupational Medicine; L.A. Liversedge of the Department of Neurology; D.A.K. Black of the Department of Medicine; E.V. Browett of the Associated Ocel Company at Ellesmere Port, Cheshire (an analyst of the latter company, which manufactures tetraethyllead and their brand of antiknock preparations); and Dennis Malcolm, the physician in a local Storage Battery Manufacturing Plant, to educate the local professional people in modern concepts of lead poisoning. The discussions which are the subject of this reference (81) followed the lectures, and are combinations of discussions of some of the contents of the lectures, plus information which the discussant considered to be pertinent and intrinsically valuable. This Conference, therefore, is a local professional affair of a general nature in a specific locality (in and around Manchester). I hardly think that its documentation in the Archives need go beyond the reference given. The latter is easily found, but is not of earthshaking importance, and the lectures and discussions would not be published except for the fact that one of the lecturers, Dr. Ronald Lane, is indeed a well known figure in Occupational Medicine in England. Since, however, you may have a different attitude about this reference, I give you below the names of the lecturers and the titles of their lectures.

Session I -

- a. Lane, Ronald E.: Health Hazards From Metals in Industry. Ann. Occup. Hyg. 8:5-11, 1965.
 - b. Liversedge, L.A.: Metals and the Central Nervous System. Ann. Occup. Hyg. 8:13-16, 1965.
 - c. Black, D.A.K.: Metals and the Kidney. Ann. Occup. Hyg. 8:17-20, 1965.
- Session II
- a. Lane, Ronald E.: The Clinical Aspects of Poisoning by Inorganic Lead Compounds. 8:31-34, 1965.
 - b. Malcolm, Dennis: Industrial Control of Personnel. Ann. Occup. Med. 8:35-42, 1965.

Discussion

The discussants were Dr. L. Magos, an investigator in the Medical Research Council Laboratories, Toxicological Research Unit of Carshalton Surrey. (This is a governmentally supported unit directed by a friend of mine, Dr. Barnes. It is also not far from Manchester, so that Dr. Lane would be disposed to call upon them in setting up a local program just as he included the people from The Associated Ocel Company, whose manufacturing plant is nearby, in Cheshire.) Others participated in the discussion - Dr. R. L. McCallum, Dr. J.A. Bonnell, Dr. S.G. Rainsford, Dr. R. J. Sherwood, Dr. H. Buchwald, and, of course, the original speakers but chiefly Dr. Lane, head of the procedure and Nuffield Professor of the University of Manchester. I have gone to some length to present the picture to you, for such disposition as you may wish to make of it.

10. If I were you, I would not cite references 86 to 96 in the manuscript. The reader will of necessity turn to Table 3 (page 14), where these references are given (I presume) in proper sequence, and where they are available for discussion. Since the sentences on page 14 relate altogether to the contents of Table 3, there is, I believe, no proper place in any sentence at which to cite the reference. The information about the references on page 14 is important only in relation to specific references about which no one knows anything, except that indicated in Table 3, until he has read the contents of each reference.

11. Your deletion of the acknowledgment is noted and agreed to.

12. The shortening of the titles for the Tables is entirely satisfactory, so far as meaning is concerned. The footnote identified by symbol (paragraph mark), together with the note itself, can be deleted entirely. The note is a bit of general information which relates to no particular point or paragraph, but to the entire set of calculations. I perceive on looking over the Table, that neither term (x nor y) actually appear within the Table. Others, as yourself, may be puzzled by it, and, therefore, this footnote had better be deleted entirely.

* I looked up the composition of Mosatil-Bayer in a compendium of German official agents, and found that the formula is Na_2Ca Edetate, as I suspected.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Page 8, Line 12 - A comma after "were," would seem to be advisable, if not highly necessary, to the reader's understanding.

Page 19, Line 18 - The comma between "regarded" and "as the best" should be deleted. It was left in by mistake, in all likelihood, when a limiting phrase between these words in the original manuscript was deleted.

Page 20, Line 3 - A "nit-picking and, perhaps, highly personal suggestion would be that "which" is preferable to "that" in this line.

General Comment: Your painstaking work on the Tables, which are very elaborate and difficult, I think, is quite a remarkable achievement, for which I have both gratitude and admiration.