

FILE NAME: Saranac (SAR)

DATE: 1948 Dec 14

DOC#: SAR178

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Letter from NYU College of Medicine to Saranac Laboratory with Commentary on Asbestos Report Part 1

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
(UNIVERSITY AND BELLEVUE HOSPITAL MEDICAL COLLEGE)
477 FIRST AVENUE, NEW YORK 16, N.Y.

DEPARTMENT OF PREVENTIVE MEDICINE
Institute of Industrial
Medicine

TELEPHONE: JORDEN 3-1800
NY 3-1800

December 14, 1948

Dr. Arthur Vorwald
Saranac Laboratory
Saranac Lake, New York

Dear Arthur:

With respect to the asbestos report, Part I, September 30, 1948, a meeting of the representatives of the underwriting companies was held in New York. The report was favorably received and it was the general feeling that it was a most satisfactory and excellent job. It was the feeling of this group that all references to cancer or tumors should be omitted (Paragraph 75, Page 31 - the introductory paragraph under "COMPLICATIONS" - Paragraph 92, Page 39). This request would likewise call for the elimination of any tables relating to this subject matter.

The group felt that there might be included under "CONCLUSIONS" a reference to the non-progressive character of the fibrosis produced by the asbestos. ✓

If practicable, they would like to see a more definite statement with respect to the size of the fibres which do the damage. Inquiry was also made as to whether there was any relation to the number of fibres per cubic foot of air. ✓

It was felt that the language in Conclusion D, that is, that a typical fibrosis could be produced by an atmospheric suspension of asbestos dust containing only "an extremely small proportion of long fibres" was too vague and should be defined more specifically. ✓

In addition to the above comments there are other suggestions which relate more to form and emphasis:

To the extent permitted by the results of the experiments make the "CONCLUSIONS" and the introductory "ABSTRACT" more definite, and reduce the number of words whose meanings are not precise. For example, in the "ABSTRACT" the words "seems", "relatively", "apparently", "is believed" and in "CONCLUSIONS", page 40, the words "primarily", "extremely small proportion".

As far as practicable conform the "ABSTRACT" to "CONCLUSIONS". For example, "CONCLUSIONS" states that "short asbestos fibres do not produce fibrosis", whereas "ABSTRACT" says that "short fibres are relatively inert".



US
337

Where experimental results indicate that asbestos fibre produces a different action than that caused by free silica, emphasize these points by reference to the differences as, for instance, particle size, mechanical rather than chemical action, non-progression, and predisposition to tuberculosis.

In CONCLUSION I, page 41, reference is made in the fourth line to "our usual experience" and in the last line, bottom of page, "previous experience". Just what was meant by this reference was not clear to the group and they would like to see that item clarified.

It was felt that the report would be somewhat easier to follow if the paragraphs dealing with the various types of experiments were separated by headings. For example, Paragraphs 11 to 24 inclusive, deal with the early King's Filate experiments; Paragraphs 25 to 44 deal with the 200-mesh material to which was added one part in four of unground material; Paragraphs 45 to 57 inclusive, deal with the 100% ball-milled dust experiments, and Paragraphs 58 to 76 inclusive, deal with the long fibre experiments. There was confusion as to the experiments referred to in some of the numbered paragraphs. It would be helpful if the four experiments were headed up in some manner other than with the regularly numbered paragraphs which precede and follow them.

It was decided that after these revisions have been concluded the report of these experimental studies should be published as promptly as possible, preferably in the Journal of Industrial Hygiene. Any report on human asbestosis should be separate and not a part of this report.

The above comprises various comments and suggestions which I do not think involves any material change in the report. Please let me know if you wish any further information or discussions of the points raised in this letter.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Tony.
A. J. Lanza