

ITL  
460

R & D Dent

DGF/THT/5.1.1

7 September 1982

R S Wade Esq  
Imperial Tobacco Limited  
PO Box 6500  
Montreal  
PQ  
Canada  
H3C 3L6

Dear Bob

As I told you on the telephone just now, I was in the midst of reconsidering your letter of 30 July and enclosures when you called. Ray Thornton has already sent you his comments (letter dated 2 September). I'm sorry we couldn't send you a concerted reply but holiday schedules didn't match, and Ray went ahead unilaterally.

My own views haven't changed very much from what I wrote on 24 January but I had not then read Prof Ecobichon's letter and papers dated 11 May, nor Peter Brown's comments.

I'll try not to confuse things too much, so will add peripheral views to Ray Thornton's comments.

Ambient Smoke and AHH Induction

1. I agree that the phrasing on page 3 is particularly infelicitous
2. Even if ambient smoke is bound to possess biological activity, I am not sure it is sensible to choose as a test, one like AHH-inducibility which is so sensitive and which works like an on/off switch.
3. I agree with Ray about the danger of extrapolating from AHH to man, but I don't think that deleting a phrase from a letter will necessarily alter the way people's minds work. It may make the project palatable to the other member companies of CTMC, but won't Prof Ecobichon extrapolate nevertheless?

Contd.../2

103543569

R S Wade Esq, Imperial Tobacco Ltd Contd  
7 September 1982

4. All in all, I think Peter Brown, Ray and myself are in broad agreement, but differ as to the desirability of undertaking the work. I rest somewhere between the other two, but incline towards Peter Brown.

Micronucleus Test

1. Au fond, this research is an attempt to develop another "short-term" test, which will either replicate existing tests or produce discordant results. As you know, I am basically unhappy about short-term tests, unless they illuminate the mechanisms likely to be involved in a particular biological system. This particular test is, perhaps, more appropriate than the Ames Test, but until it is investigated and thoroughly proved, we cannot decide whether or not it will be adaptable for product development studies.
2. While Ray's comment on Peter Brown's second point is valid, the authors don't have a great record of success in the past. As for it being "mere opinion", that's all we can offer. We have no experience to draw on.
3. I agree with Ray that the project is suitable for a university-based research, but I disagree with his view that Peter Brown is over-pontifical. If you have the money available, I would support it still (as I said in January); but if money is short, I think it might be better spent elsewhere, eg with Edith Zorychta.

Hopefully, you'll get this before you leave for UK. If not, I'll give you a copy on 20 September.

Looking forward to your visit. Love to Jane.

Yours sincerely



D G FELTON

CC Dr R E Thornton

103543570