

To: ryan, strober, emslie, wagner  
From: Marty Keller <Martin\_Keller@Brown.edu>  
Subject: Partial Draft Response  
Cc: me  
Bcc:

X-Attachments:  Ryan-Respon P/P  Keller's Resp. p/p-6/12  
 Comments on June10 Pax-P

To All:

This should be the last you here from me tonight until tomorrow night. I am extremely concerned that leaving us vulnerable to the wolves is not a major or even minoor concern to our "partners".

I also know how busy you are and how tight the time is, though we are not without leverage if we are dissatisfied and want to play a little hardball of our own. I think we have more clout if we respond rapidly - assuming they will not take some of our most important changes. Sooooo..... here is a rough partial first draft. It is on 3 documents : last draft of my list of specific issues that have not been respondeed to in this draft, Neal's outline of issues aand some edits/comments in the June 19th iteration of paper that we are dissatisfied with. I only reviewed what we had requested before, except the 3 paper breakout, since if we want to fight that battle we will have to go to senior management. I am willing to do that if we agree that after the changes are made to this draft we are still hung out to dry.\*\*\*\*\*Please clean up my writing if it is not pproper English , sounds way too harsh, or is inaccurate..\*\*\*\*\*

Dear David, Phil and Alan,

We are all extremely dismayed with your message that Senior Management insists on 1 paper, rejectting our strong recommendation that it is not pproper and that 3 separate papers are necessary to accurately report on this major issue.

We will work with you to modify the current paper, but reserve the judgment to renew our argument for 3 papers if we are unable to fix this one to our satisfaction. A critical issue will be whether working together we are able to explain in detail what is different here than in 329 about 329, annd in the presentation about the other 2 studies, so that it is 100% clear in this paper that there is no way to read it and think that 329 is being criticized and that it was not written with complete integrity and accuracy given the data we had and should have had as investigator's, on the part of the investigators and

Printed for Marty Keller <Martin\_Keller@Brown.edu>

our colleagues from SK who worked on it. We also want it to be crystall clear that any new data or analyses, case report forms, narratives etc. you have worked with since 329 was published, was not made available to the 329 investigator's by SK, otherwise we could look foolish, naive, incompetent or " biased "( the most likely accusation that will be made ) to present things in a way that was favorable to SK, disregarding our responsibility to the proper scientific method, to the public, children and their families.

Should should also prepare your management that it is unreasonable for us to be given 3 working days to go through this process as there are many of you and of us, and we all have other jobs. Most importantly, our last responses were rapid are we have waited over 3 weeks for a response from you.