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

Dr. Arthur Vorwald
Karmane Laboratory
Saranac Lake, New York

Dear Arthur:

With respect to the asbestos report, Part I, September 30, 1942, 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 refer-
ences to cancer or tumors should be omitted (Paragraph 75, Page 31 - the intro-
ductive paragraph under "CONCLUSIONS" - 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.

It was felt that the language in Conclusion B, that is, that a typical
fibrosis could be produced by an atmospheric suspension of asbestos dust contain-
ing "an extremely small proportion of long fibres" was too vague and should be de-
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 num-
ber of words whose meanings are not precise. For example, in the "ABSTRACT" the words
"seem", "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".
Where experimental results indicate that asbestos fibres produce a different reaction than that caused by free silica, emphasize these points by reference to the differences as, for instance, particle size, mechanical ratio, 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 22 inclusive, deal with the early King's Float experiments; Paragraphs 23 to 44 deal with the 200-mesh material to which was added one part in four of unwashed 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 my various comments and suggestions which I do not think involve 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,

[Signature]

A. J. Lanes