

From: [Kathryn Guyton](#)
To: [Blair, Aaron \(NIH/NCI\) \[V\]](#); [Straif Kurt \[REDACTED\]](#); [Dana Loomis](#); [Guadin \[REDACTED\]](#)
Subject: Re: Interview with Betsy Jibben and the Farm Journal
Date: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 10:08:12 AM

Dear Aaron,

Thanks for your efforts. With regard to the WHO report, below is some background information. However I believe it may be too technical. It may be easier to say that the Working Group made an independent judgement of the data provided in WHO and other government reports. According to the IARC monograph published procedures, results in rats and mice were judged "positive" if they were statistically significant.

Hope this helps, and good luck with the further interviews. I will likely speak with the NY Times later today, but hope to save the German and South American inquiries for the German-speaking Kurt and Spanish-speaking Dana. Here's an article in Le Monde:

http://www.lemonde.fr/planete/article/2015/03/25/le-desherbant-roundup-classe-cancerogene_4600906_3244.html

Best,
Kate



The WHO-JMPR report is available here:

http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2006/9241665203_eng.pdf?ua=1

According to [published procedures](#), the IARC Working Group made an independent assessment of the data provided in the WHO-JMPR report. Specifically, the Working Group determined that there was a statistically significant positive trend in the incidence of haemangiosarcoma in male mice. Based on this statistically significant finding, the Working Group reached the conclusion that this study provided positive evidence of carcinogenicity in experimental animals. This Working Group conclusion, and not the conclusion of the JMPR, is presented in the Lancet Oncology summary.

From: <Blair>, "Aaron [V] (NIH/NCI)" [REDACTED]
Date: Wednesday 25 March 2015 14:54
To: Kate Guyton <[REDACTED]>, "Straif Kurt [REDACTED]" [REDACTED], Dana Loomis [REDACTED], "Loukissas, Jennifer (NIH/NCI) [E]" <[REDACTED]>, "[Guadin \[REDACTED\]](#)" [REDACTED]
Subject: Interview with Betsy Jibben and the Farm Journal

She asked several times why the IARC findings differed for other reviews. I pointed out that

new studies become available and reviews are for different purposes. She asked why the IARC evaluation was different from other parts of WHO. I was not sure what this was about, but indicated that IARC was the organized that WHO specifically tasks with developing hazard assessments.

I have one other person who wants to talk to me. Charles Benbrook at Washington State University. I will talk to him today.

Aaron

From: Kathryn Guyton [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2015 5:40 PM
To: Blair, Aaron (NIH/NCI) [V]; Straif Kurt ([REDACTED]); Dana Loomis
Cc: blairkansas@nih.gov [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Pesticide interviews

Dear Aaron,

Thanks so much for all your efforts.

With regard to the different evaluations, it is of note that a key human study on genotoxicity cited in the Lancet Oncology summary (Bolognesi et al., 2009; <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19672767/>) is NOT cited in the German BfR draft report (<http://dar.efsa.europa.eu/dar-web/provision>). This is somewhat at odds with the statement "Each of the studies considered by IARC have been previously reviewed and considered by regulatory agencies – most recently by the German government on behalf of the European Union."— <http://news.monsanto.com/news/monsanto-disagrees-iarc-classification-glyphosate>

Keep up the good work!
Kate

From: <Blair>, "Aaron [V] (NIH/NCI)"

[REDACTED]
Date: Monday 23 March 2015 22:24

To: "Straif Kurt ([REDACTED])", Dana Loomis ([REDACTED]), Kate Guyton

[REDACTED], "<guadinn@nih.gov>,"

Cc: "blairkansas@nih.gov" [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Pesticide interviews

Dear All,

Below is a listing of press contacts today. I have talked with everyone below except Betsy Jibben. I expect her to call me. I also talked with the German report (whose name I have forgotten) that Nicolas arranged.

Nothing special about any of the calls or questions. I made sure they understood the Working Process and how the evaluations were made. They were interested in why the IARC evaluations were different than those done earlier elsewhere. I pointed out the new information becomes available over time.

Aaron

From: Loukissas, Jennifer (NIH/NCI) [E]
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2015 4:01 PM
To: Blair, Aaron (NIH/NCI) [V]
Cc: Fisher, Victoria (NIH/NCI) [E]; Loukissas, Jennifer (NIH/NCI) [E]
Subject: Pesticide interviews

Dan Charles, NPR National Ag reporter – [REDACTED] 5:30 PM Deadline

Laura Dattaro VICE news video news channel/site
(<http://news.vice.com/>)<UrlBlockedError.aspx><UrlBlockedError.aspx>
Phone: [REDACTED]

Reporter: Betsy Jibben
Outlet: Farm Journal Media (will capture material for radio as well)
Phone: [REDACTED]

Reporter: Durrie Bouscaren, Health & Science Desk
St. Louis Public Radio | 90.7 KWMU
University of Missouri-St. Louis
PHONE: [REDACTED]

Jennifer K. Loukissas, M.P.P.
Communication Manager
Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics
National Cancer Institute
9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 7E-434

o: [REDACTED]
m: [REDACTED]
e: [REDACTED]

Follow on Twitter @NCIEpiTraining<<https://twitter.com/NCIEpiTraining>>
@jloukissas<<https://twitter.com/jloukissas>>
Join us on LinkedIn NCI Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics<https://www.linkedin.com/groups?home=&gid=8205837&trk=anet_ug_hm>

This message and its attachments are strictly confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender and delete it. Since its integrity cannot be guaranteed, its content cannot involve the sender's responsibility. Any misuse, any disclosure or publication of its content, either whole or partial, is prohibited, exception made of formally approved use.

This message and its attachments are strictly confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender and delete it. Since its integrity cannot be guaranteed, its content cannot involve the sender's responsibility. Any misuse, any disclosure or publication of its content, either whole or partial, is prohibited, exception made of formally approved use.
