

From: Joe Gray<grayjo@ohsu.edu>
Sent on: Tuesday, April 19, 2022 6:02:00 PM
To: Ourania Kosti<OKosti@nas.edu>
CC: Gayle Woloschak [REDACTED]; Dewji, Shaheen A<shaheen.dewji@gatech.edu>
Subject: Re: HPS and history of LNT by Calabrese
Attachments: Nameless.txt (10.52 KB)

Thanks Rania and Gayle

I can live with Rania's answer. But I do hope someone publishes a counter to Calabrese sometime soon.

Joe

On Apr 19, 2022, at 8:20 AM, Kosti, Ourania <OKosti@nas.edu> wrote:

Joe,

Thanks for the explanation [REDACTED]

In addition to Gayle's response, I can provide a suggestion on how to respond to those who ask why the committee did not address the Calabrese papers.

My view is that the committee was not tasked with reviewing the history of the LNT and balance the evidence in support or against it. As you have noted at public meetings a number of times, this committee is not tasked with making policy recommendations. The use of the LNT is a policy decision. The committee carefully states that based on new scientific evidence, agencies could change their risk assessments for cancer and other endpoints.

Rania

From: Joe Gray <grayjo@ohsu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2022 10:57 AM
To: Gayle Woloschak [REDACTED]
Cc: Dewji, Shaheen A <shaheen.dewji@gatech.edu>; Kosti, Ourania <OKosti@nas.edu>
Subject: Re: HPS and history of LNT by Calabrese
Sorry to be difficult - [REDACTED]

but what I see is a Society backing Calabresi and a lot of PUBLISHED papers articulating his positions that are critical of some of the institutions with which we are associated including the NAS. I know we have discussed this and that you have asserted that there are issues with his positions. However, we as a committee have not done a thorough review of the evidence behind your assertions. Selfishly, I also think it is very likely that I as a defender of this document will be asked about the lack of attention to these publications by unfriendly questioners. As it sits, I would be left to say that the committee did not find them credible but I would not be able to point to documents that back up the lack of credibility. So while you say that that citing them might be a problem, I can certainly see downsides to not citing them - namely that the NAS could be accused of suppressing "uncomfortable truths" as other agencies have done in the past. Perception is important. 99% of our readers will have access only to the published literature. The fact that the reviewers did not pick up on it does not mean that our detractors won't.

I am not going to push this any farther but I will appreciate a suggestion about how to respond to questions about why we did not cite, should those questions arise.

Joe

On Apr 19, 2022, at 4:05 AM, Gayle Woloschak <