
From: Sturgess Nick GBAP
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2002 5:27 PM
To: Clapp Mike GBAP
Subject: RE: Epidemiology review for Syngenta

Mike,
I have now read Pedersen's comments and I guess they don't really give us much scope to dismiss the claimed pesticide links on the basis of fundamental flaws in the study design or analysis. Her biggest criticism of a study would appear to be the one emphasising a genetic component rather than an environmental link (*Maher et al* 2002), which is unfortunate.

Clearly her view is that the papers support a strong environmental component to the cause(s) of PD with little contribution from genetic components. It is interesting that the 1987 Canadian study implicating well water and PQ is considered to be fundamentally flawed, and the authors' conclusions concerning the role of well water and the role of other exposures is thought to be totally unfounded.

It would appear from her comments that the *Liou et al* (1997) study based on an Asian (Taiwan) population, which concluded there was a positive association with PQ, is not considered flawed and the authors conclusions are considered reasonable. The lack of exposure information, as pointed out by Pedersen, is important here though.

Overall, it would seem that the flavour of Pedersen's comments can be summarised as there is good epidemiological evidence for environmental factors (such as pesticides) playing a significant role in the aetiology of PD, and that exposure to PQ may be one component of this. However, the epidemiological evidence does not **conclusively** show PQ is involved.

Nick.

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

From: Clapp Mike GBAP
Sent: 22 October 2002 07:44
To: Smith Lewis GBAP; Sturgess Nick GBAP
Subject: FW: Epidemiology review for Syngenta
Importance: High

Lewis, Nick,
Please find attached Prof. Pedersen's review.
I have currently limited circulation to the two of you plus Martin Wilks. I hope to discuss with him tomorrow morning. If you remember we asked Prof. Pedersen to review these papers and confirm if,
1. She agreed with the authors' conclusions, if not please explain why and
2. To summarise the strengths and weaknesses of the case.
Your comments would be appreciated - What does this mean for paraquat, what are the next steps? I will draft our position once I have everyone's comments. I believe we should consider a follow up discussion with her, maybe inviting her to Alderley Park, so that we can maximise those involved.
Thanks, Mike

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

From: Nancy Pedersen [<mailto:Nancy.Pedersen@mep.ki.se>]
Sent: 18 October 2002 14:16
To: Sheldon Ros GBAP
Cc: Clapp Mike GBAP
Subject: RE: Epidemiology review for Syngenta

Dear Drs. Sheldon and Clapp:

Attached is my review concerning Parkinson's disease. I note from the references of the selected papers that there were many other articles that perhaps would have been of at least as great relevance as those you asked me to review. Hence, I hope you realize that I have restricted my review only to those you have given me, and by no means believe that this generalizes to the findings on risk factors for Parkinsons in general.

Sincerely,
Nancy Pedersen