

Compilation of Comments from the SAB Libby Amphibole Asbestos Panel Members on the July Draft Report (as of 7/20/2012):

Dr. Lippman:

Cover Letter:

<u>Page</u>	<u>line</u>	<u>Comment</u>
-------------	-------------	----------------

1	28	insert “However, there are many areas that need more consideration, and” after “written”. Without this change in the letter, it appears that the July draft is more satisfactory than we found it to be.
---	----	--

Main Document:

<u>Page</u>	<u>line</u>	<u>Comment</u>
-------------	-------------	----------------

1	14	change “structure” to “structural”.
15	4	change “structure” to “structural”.
2	26	insert “, which is a component of LAA” after “tremolite”.
5	38	insert a comma before “which”.
16	29	insert “among” after “are”.
17	16	insert “ of chrysotile fibers” after “exclusion”.
20	34	insert “with the LAA mixture” after “study”.
21	6	change “short term” to “short-term”.
21	14	change the 2 nd “i.e.” to “e.g.”.
21	19	change “is” to “are”.
35	3	insert “used” before “until”.
36	10	change “two stage” to “two-stage”.
36	34	insert a comma before “but”.
41	18	“inter alia” should be “ <i>inter alia</i> ”.
43	30	change “i.e.” to “e.g.”.

Dr. Sheppard:

p. 1: Use of "However" to start two consecutive sentences could be revised. (lines 17 & 18)

p 5 lines 11-12: I think the sentence about the scientific use of TSFE doesn't come across as clearly as it should in this executive summary. I suggest revising the sentence to say: "EPA should clarify the scientific basis for the use of time since first exposure (TSFE) in their models."

p 5 line 26: Consider replacing "target" with "quantity" since the wording was changed from "target of inference" to "quantity of interest".

p 5 line 27: I think the use of the word "alternative" could be misinterpreted to exclude the primary cumulative exposure estimate. I suggest replacing this word with "various" both here and later. (I recognize I wrote this but on rereading I'm concerned that our intent could be misinterpreted in the current wording.)

p 20 line 10: remove second period

p 29 line 37: replace "alternative" with "various" for the reasons given above.

p 31 line 18: The topic of exposure-dependent censoring is a new item, not a part of the bulleted list about comments on covariates. Please take it out of the list. Also make sure it stands alone since it was explicitly addressed in the charge question.

p 31 line 16: This point is not about covariates either but of a different order of importance than the exposure-dependent censoring since that topic was explicitly included in the charge question. Probably remove this point as part of the bulleted list also and let it just stand alone.

p 36 line 4: I don't understand why this paragraph starts with "However".

p 36 line 11: There appear to be one or more words missing here.

p 36 line 40: The word "inappropriate" seems too strong to me. I suggest softening such as by substituting with something else such as "can be misleading". However I was not involved in this response so I defer to the authors.

p 40 line 43: The quote includes "(emphasis added)" but there is no emphasis. What don't I understand?