
From: Gaworski, Charles L.
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2003 12:11 PM
Subject: FW: Second repro manuscript

DSS: ?



2nd manuscript.doc
(227 KB)

-----Original Message-----

From: Faqi_Ali [mailto:Faqi_Ali@Allergan.com]
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 2:27 PM
To: Charles.L.Gaworski@pmusa.com
Subject: RE: Second repro manuscript

Chuck,

My comments are highlighted. I have added in the manuscript a reference on the transfer of nicotine in milk. I also have a friendly suggestion and that is follow:

Make subtitles for the F1 generation results exactly as you had in tables:

For example:

- 1) F1 generation survival and growth data
- 2) F1 generation Developmental and neurobehavioral assessment.

In addition, the explanation provided regarding the increase gestation length by a day does not seem reasonable because all the groups were handled in the same manner, there was no exception to the 600 mg TPM.

Please let me know if you have questions.

Best regards,

Ali

-----Original Message-----

From: Charles.L.Gaworski@pmusa.com [mailto:Charles.L.Gaworski@pmusa.com]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2003 10:53 AM
To: NRajendran@IITRI.ORG; Faqi_Ali
Subject: Second repro manuscript

Boys and girls:

Attached is a draft of the second repro manuscript. This was the SOT presentation. I still need to come up with a reference that nicotine is transferred in the milk. Take a look and provide any comments.

I am a little concerned about the variability in the n values for the various measurements. For instance, we supposedly culled on day 21 to reach 30 male and 30 female/group. But somehow on day 28 we ended up with 31 males in the 150 TPM group and 29 females due to a miss-sex issue at culling. The body weights for 600 TPM group appear to only start with 29 males on day 28. In looking at the individual data it appears that male 709 data are missing (page E-378), but I only see the reference on page 21 that one female died. Page E383 indicates a female death and I assume this to be

animal 901. I see a reference in the motor activity individual data that 709 died (page E-113). When did 709 die? Where the deaths of 709 and 901 accidental? Why is the male death not mentioned in the report? Was there a necropsy results? Any idea why something as simple as body weights weren't collected?

We received reviewer comments on the first manuscript and I tried to keep them in mind as I prepared this one. We responded to the comments, but have not heard about final acceptance.

Thanks
Chuck

<<Smoke Reproductive 4.doc>>