
From: Botham Phil GBJH
Sent: Thursday, January 06, 2011 6:24 PM
To: Breckenridge Charles USGR
Subject: RE: PD Risk Factors Paper

Charles

A long, but nevertheless very helpful, reply. Thanks for taking the time.

Just one follow-up question. Do you think we will achieve the deadline we stated in Glasgow for the technical reports of end March?

Phil

-----Original Message-----

From: Breckenridge Charles USGR
Sent: 06 January 2011 14:18
To: Botham Phil GBJH
Subject: PD Risk Factors Paper

Phil: in regard to inquiry on the PD paper and the status of the technical reports.

Mandel has always been the point man on the PD paper. Now he is again full time at Exponent, having resigned from his position at U of Toronto, he is for the short term more accessible.

However, we cannot have a smorgasboard of email smorgasboard of commentary such as occurred on Widnes. In fact the agreement with Nadel as the contractor is that this is an independent review and we cannot be seen to try to influence.

As a general practice, since all these emails are discoverable, we should always refrain from such public discourse.

For the PD paper, Lewis and I have agreed that I would provide Lewis my first revision to the manuscript, he would refine and improve and he would be the sole point of contact with Mandel to see if the changes can be quietly incorporated. I don't want input from the team and I suspect Lewis doesn't either. The team just has to trust that we will attempt to get the best and clearest rendition of the facts.

Ideally the communication to Mandel should occur verbally but practically that likely will not be possible. Mandel and team will be the final arbitrators.

Mandel prefers not to engage in such exchanges because he knows he might be a witness someday. Our staff do not seem to appreciate that.

In regard to submission for publication, they did want to submit the paper to Epidemiology, but in discussion with the editor, they realized that such a detailed review was not appropriate for that journal. It was never submitted there and never rejected.

The paper is under review at a European journal. I don't have the name in hand because I think Mandel only mentioned it during a teleconference. Mande thinks we can make editorial changes as long as the paper is not lengthened. We are trying to stay within these boundries.l

You inquired about the PQ study schedules and you may have heard that Merrill is retiring effective January 30. He is willing to work 2 days a week and one of his post-retirement activities will bring the backlog of old studies to draft report stage., Many of them that we have terminated work. Once they are in a satisfactory draft, we will submit to the team and we as a team will agee the final. Merrill will implement the finalization. He is going to provide a schedule soon.

In regard to the critical studies that we will take to completion, Dan and I will be directly responsible for these but I may use Merrill to do the leg work on these as well.

For the translation of the reports into publishable manuscripts, I think the task of getting the first draft falls to myself, Dan, Lewis, Nick and Kim. Those manuscripts will then go to the full team for review and finalization. We do not currently have a schedule for this activity since I believe the technical documents need to be finalized first to insure quality.

In regard to presentations at meetings, I suppose that can occur before technical reports are written but we have to be dead sure of our facts in such presentations.

You asked a simple update, you got a long reply. Sorry

CBB