From: Danielle DeVoney
To: Diana-M Wong
Cc: Bob Benson; Bob Sonawane; Charles Ris; Krista Christensen; David Bussard; Deborah McKean
Subject: Re: Fw: Remaining Data Request
Date: 02/16/2012 05:28 PM

Diana -

Hi - Yes - we are preparing a response. We have a draft memo, and two of the attachments prepared.

I will forward the information (based on Dr Sheppard's responses) - as soon as I receive the final attachment (data for Figures E-2 and E-3.) I hope to have these data soon.

I appreciate your following up on this request,
Danielle

Danielle DeVoney, PhD, DABT, PE
National Center for Environmental Assessment
USEPA Office of Research and Development
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (8623P)
Washington, DC 20460
703.347.8558
FAX: 703.347.8692

▼ Diana-M Wong---02/15/2012 03:54:35 PM---Dear All, I have not yet received the remaining data requested for posting on our website. Please f

From: Diana-M Wong/DC/USEPA/US
To: Danielle DeVoney/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Krista Christensen/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Charles Ris/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Sonawane/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 02/15/2012 03:54 PM
Subject: Fw: Remaining Data Request

Dear All,

I have not yet received the remaining data requested for posting on our website. Please fulfill this request as soon as you can.

Thank you very much.

Diana

Diana Wong, Ph. D., DABT
Toxicologist and Designated Federal Officer
USEPA

Science Advisory Board Staff Office
MC: 1400R
1200 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Washington, DC 20460

Phone:(202) 564-2049

----- Forwarded by Diana-M Wong/DC/USEPA/US on 02/15/2012 03:49 PM -----

From: Diana-M Wong/DC/USEPA/US
To: Danielle DeVoney/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Krista Christensen/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Charles Ris/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 02/10/2012 03:06 PM
Subject: Remaining Data Request

Danielle,

Attached are Dr. Sheppard's response:

note that I did not receive the attachments and they are not posted on the website, so my comments are only
informed by the attachment titles.

Just to be clear in writing, **I no longer want the raw data**.

Our memorandum (6 Feb 20112) provided additional information on the
> exposure response modeling presented in chapter 5 and Appendix E of the
> External Review Draft of the Toxicological Review of Libby Amphibole
> Asbestos currently under review, in response to your request [email, 3
> Feb2012, 4:25 PM]. As noted in that memo, we were not able to fulfill
> the third request at the time. Attachment 1 of this memo provides the
> model parameters, standard errors and p-values for the full cohort
> models shown in Table E-6 of the draft document, thus fulfilling this
> last request.
Without looking at the attachment, this seems fine.
>
> During discussion at the SAB meeting (6-8 Feb,

2012) it became apparent
> that you needed additional information regarding the Tables 1 and 2
> attached to our memorandum (6 Feb 2012). Table 1 provided LPT
> prevalence by deciles of exposure for both the full and subcohorts
> analyzed from the OM Scott worker cohort. As requested we have added a
> column for mean TSFE for each decile of exposure to this table. This
> new table is provided as attachment 2 below. This is helpful
>
> Table 2 in our 6 Feb memo provided the prevalence of localized pleural
> thickening (LPT) by quintiles of exposure, and by quintiles of time
> since first exposure (TSFE). We now understand that you would like to
> this information cross-tabulated. Attachment 3 of this memo provides
> this cross-tabulation of the prevalence of LPT by quintiles of exposure,
> further stratified by quintiles of TSFE. It is important to note that
> this is not the information plotted in Figure E-2 discussed during the
> meeting.
I don't understand the last sentence. WHy would a table of
prevalences in each cell not be the same as what is plotted?

Based on the next response, I think I misunderstood the
categorization in Figure E-2. In that case, what I really want
is the counts that correspond to each point in the figure.
Ideally I also get the number of cases (or equivalently the
prevalences since one can be obtained from the other) so this
doesn't have to be read off the figure.

Note: Without seeing the attachment, I'm not sure if it has all
I want. I also want the *number* of cohort members in each
cell, not just the prevalence estimate. I expect some cells
have very small counts.
>
> The five exposure groups in Figure E-2 of the draft document are not
> based on quintiles of exposure, but rather a priori selected categories
> of exposure (See page E-16 of the Draft document.) Per discussion

> during the SAB panel meeting we are also providing the data plotted in
> Figure E-2 both by exposure and TSFE categories used in this Figure.
> This information is provided in Attachment 4 below.
Thanks for this clarification. I had missed that detail.

I'm not completely sure about the attachments...

Diana Wong, Ph. D., DABT
Toxicologist and Designated Federal Officer
USEPA
Science Advisory Board Staff Office
MC: 1400R
1200 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Washington, DC 20460

Phone:(202) 564-2049