From:	Diana-M Wong
To:	Danielle DeVoney; Bob Benson
Cc:	Krista Christensen; Charles Ris
Subject:	Remaining Data Request
Date:	02/10/2012 03:06 PM

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