

From: **James E. Enstrom** <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Date: Wed, May 9, 2018 at 10:54 AM
Subject: More Info re May 3 PLoS Med Editorial + Guest Editorial?
To: John Ioannidis <jioannid@stanford.edu>
Cc: Marks, Sarah <smarks1@stanford.edu>

Dear John,

I greatly appreciate your prompt and professional response. However, I am very disappointed that you found the reply to my reanalysis more convincing than my reanalysis. Please give me your opinion of the [not] attached May 6 version of my forthcoming Dose-Response reply to the reply, which is FOR YOU ONLY. The fully corrected version of my reply should appear online very soon [see <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5987237/>]. FYI, my reply has been held up for one year by SAGE in order to arrive at wording that is satisfactory to them (I believe to minimize their legal liability). In order to resolve the validity of Pope 1995 (your Reference 9) and HEI 2000 (your Reference 10), I propose that you email/call ACS VP Epidemiology Susan M. Gapstur: susan.gapstur@cancer.org (404) 329-5741 . Ask her if she has identified any errors in my reanalysis. Also, ask her if she will cooperate with you and me in resolving the differences between Pope 1995 and Enstrom 2017.

Finally, please let me know if I can publish a PLoS Guest Editorial on this subject.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Jim

From: John Ioannidis <jioannid@stanford.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 8:22 AM
To: James E. Enstrom <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Cc: Marks, Sarah <smarks1@stanford.edu>
Subject: Re: Request to Discuss & Respond to May 3 PLoS Med Editorial

Dear James,

thank you for your kind message and for sharing your interesting re-analysis. I was aware of it, as well as of the reply to your re-analysis which I found more convincing.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5734464/>

In all, I believe that my statement in the editorial is correct. There are very few fields in epidemiology where there is such a strong culture of transparency and openness as in the analysis and re-analysis of these pivotal studies. The fact that you could perform a re-analysis (even though I don't fully agree with how you analyzed the data) further proves my point. What is really nice is that scientists can do re-analyses and then others can see these re-analysis and judge their validity. I think that the data are strong, but of course you have every right to think otherwise. It is transparent though why and how we disagree.

Best wishes

John

From: James E. Enstrom <jenstrom@ucla.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 9, 2018 2:07:10 AM
To: John Ioannidis
Cc: Marks, Sarah
Subject: Request to Discuss & Respond to May 3 PLoS Med Editorial

May 9, 2018

Professor John P. A. Ioannidis
Stanford Prevention Research Center
jioannid@stanford.edu
c/o Sarah Marks
smarks1@stanford.edu

Dear Professor Ioannidis,

As a follow-up to my Tuesday telephone call to Sarah Marks, I am writing regarding your May 3, 2018 PLoS Medicine Editorial "All science should inform policy and regulation" (PLoS Med 15(5): e1002576 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002576>). The following sentences in your sixth paragraph are incorrect: "The Six Cities [8] and American Cancer Society [9] studies are exemplary large-scale investigations, with careful application of methods, detailed scrutiny of measurements, replication of findings, and, importantly, detailed re-analysis of results and assessment of their robustness by entirely independent investigators [10]. The re-analysis and sensitivity analyses were conducted by the Health Effects Institute that was funded by stakeholders some of whom may have desired to see opposite conclusions."

My March 28, 2017 Dose-Response article "Fine particulate matter and total mortality in Cancer Prevention Study Cohort Reanalysis" (<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1559325817693345>) found that both the ACS CSP II study [9] and HEI Reanalysis Report [10] are seriously flawed and do not support the claim that fine particulate matter causes premature deaths. I have conducted the first truly independent reanalysis of the ACS study, based on my recent access to the CPS II data, and no errors have been identified in my reanalysis. I request the opportunity to speak with you about this matter as soon as possible. Also, I request the opportunity to publish a PLoS Medicine Editorial which documents the importance of transparency, reproducibility, and access to underlying data for studies that are used as the basis for EPA standards and regulations.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my important requests.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Enstrom, PhD, MPH, FFACE
UCLA and Scientific Integrity Institute
jenstrom@ucla.edu
(310) 472-4274