

October 26, 2005

Dear Vincent,

I am sending here below my comments on the draft of the Preamble to the Monographs.

1. page 2. line 27-28. I suggest to insert the words “and risk characterization”, after “hazard identification”, to delete the rest of the sentence, and insert instead a new sentence as follows: “The word risk has been in the title of the Monographs since the inception of the programme”. I encourage you and the group to consider that the distinction between hazard and risk, in the way it is described here, exists only in English. (Hazard in French has a quite different meaning).
2. page 2. lines 42-44. I have some serious doubt about the statement made in the last part of the sentence. As a matter of fact I believe that some of the last IARC Scientific Publication should not guide the Monographs Working Groups. My suggestion therefore is to delete the last part of the sentence, after “Publications”.
3. page 4. line 14 . I suggest inserting after “(section12)”: “and it is clear that they are the result of totally independent research.”
4. page 6 . lines 12-14. The text as it appears now seems to imply that never again sections of the first draft of the monographs may be prepared by meeting participants. I suggest returning to the original text.
5. page 6 Lines 26-27. The six months term seem unrealistic, and suggest to modify: “six months to one year...”
6. page 8. line 19. The words “may also” should be replaced by “are also”, as it was originally in Supplement 7. It seems unjustified to underestimate the contribution of case reports.
7. page 14, line 13. I suggest replacing “cell proliferation is a strong determinant” with “cell proliferation may be a determinant”.
8. pages 16-17. I feel that McGregor et al. 1999 deserves to be quoted, but just once, not three times.
9. page 18. I suggest to insert a sentence on the section “Cancer in experimental animals” concerning the effects of the combined exposure to a modifying agent (e.g. a promoting agent or another carcinogen).
10. page 19. I wonder whether the term “Rationale” would be more reader’s friendly than ‘Integration”.

11. page 20. Sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity: It is definitely useful to identify target organ(s). My suggestion is, however, that the Working Group pays attention to the wording of the evidence of carcinogenicity in different organs in order to avoid misinterpretations and misunderstandings. For instance to state that there is sufficient evidence for one organ and limited for an other organ, should not appear to automatically imply that tumors in the latter cannot be attributed to the agent.

12. page 22. Lines 7-11. This short paragraph may need to be clarified.

Thanks for letting me comment on the draft and congratulations of the excellent work you and your groups have done.

With best regards  
Lorenzo