

18 December, 1993

Mr. John Lepere  
Chairman, CECCM

RE: Pandora's Box

Dear John:

1) Following your fax to me of 29.11.93 I wrote and spoke to Dr. David Rowland in order to arrive at a suitably amended text for re-submission of the article. We have agreed that the following changes will resolve any problems.

a. The paper's claims about none of the 11 studies being statistically significant at 95% confidence level is correct- though Peter Lee's caveat that had "Fontham presented an adjusted RR compared to the combined control groups she would have achieved statistical significance", should be remembered.

b. The paper's claim that only one study is statistically significant at 90% confidence level is correct.

John, you should note that I am deferring on this issue to your members wishes- specifically PM and RJR- about stating the strongest case possible on statistical significance. (The importance of the matter was brought home to me last week when I met on another matter (the Canadian advertising ban appeal to the Supreme Court) with RJR Vice President and General Counsel, Dan Donahue, who will be arguing the EPA case and who emphasised that RJR will be taking the position that there is no significance to any of the studies and no reasonable basis for the EPA decision) At the sametime you should be aware that an article like this is not easy to get published and receives an enormous amount of very careful reviewing. By taking this position on statistical significance in the face of the reviewer's comments you retain the company's position but might risk having the paper accepted for publication.

c. Page 10, last paragraph

The first two sentences are replaced with the following:

" In performing the meta-analysis the EPA used 90% confidence intervals for correspondence to a one-tailed test of the null-hypothesis at a 5% level of significance."

d. Page 10 last paragraph, last sentence

" The assumption that a one tailed test is legitimate has never been made for any of the EPA's previous risk assessments, even though the agency presumably had also assumed that exposure to the agent could not produce a protective effect."

2025495220

... 2

e. Page 9 line 11  
after "NONE reported a strong relative risk" add (2.5 being  
the highest."

2) I have just received the attached copy of a version of Pandora's Box published last week in the Bostonia magazine. The editor heard me present on the topic at a PM/RIT/RJR sponsored conference. The Bostonia is sent free to all of the alumni of Boston University and is not peer-reviewed. Publication of this different version in the popular press will not, of course, make it ineligible for publication in a scholarly review. I should note, however, that "popular" publication might have significant advantages for your members. An article published in Canada's national newspaper on ETS which attacked the EPA decision has attracted an enormous amount of interest and letters to the editor and might well help influence the political and policy climate more than publication in a journal with a circulation of 2400. This was certainly the view of RJR's Donahue who had received a copy of Pandora's Box from John Rupp and thought it the best thing he had read on the issue. (He thought we should try for publication in the NY Times or the Wall Street Journal or some other quality North American or European paper.)

3) I am sorry to have missed your call yesterday. Unfortunately, I am on holiday from tomorrow until January 4. I will call your office then.

With all good wishes for the season,

John C. Luik

2025495221