BERKELEY . DAVIS . IRVINE . LOS ANGELES . RIVERSIDE . SAN DIECO . SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA . SANTA CRUZ

MULTIPLE RISK FACTOR INTERVENTION TRIAL

UCD BUILDING 2233 STOCKTON BOULEVARD SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95817 (916) 453-2761 or (916) 453-2760 or (916) 453-2950

November 6, 1974

Charles T. Kaelber, M.D. National Heart and Lung Institute Landow Building, Room C819J 7910 Woodmont Avenue Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Dear Chuck:

Because I have been away from the office, I have not been able to respond to your October 15 memorandum on the subject of "Appointment of a MRFIT Membership Committee," as you had requested me to do by October 31, 1974. Even though the deadline you had imposed is passed, I wish, nevertheless, to register my opposition to the entire issue, and the manner by which it was handled during the last meeting of the Steering Committee in Chicago. I, therefore, feel it inappropriate for me to comment one way or another on Dr. Paul's nomination for the Membership Committee.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

Nemat O. Borhani, M.D.

NOB: lml

cc:

Dr. Oglesby Paul

MRFIT Principal Investigators



AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

535 NORTH DEARBORN STREET • CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610 • PHONE (312) 751-6000 • TWX 910-221-0300

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

ROBERT H. MOSER, MD Chief Editor HENRY T. RICKETTS, MD Contributing Editor 751-6326

November 1, 1974

Henry Blackburn, MD Laboratory of Physiological Hygiene University of Minnesota School of Public Health Stadium Gate 27 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Doctor Blackburn:

The manuscript by you and Dr. Trapp recently submitted to The Journal of the American Medical Association under the title "Coronary risk screening and evaluation. A learning exercise for medical students" has been reviewed by members of the editorial staff. Although I am sure thatyou and the students have enjoyed this program, there seems to be an increasing belief that teaching by laboratory experiments in science has been overdone and is an expensive way to learn, both in time and profit. For this reason, and because the paper is pretty long, we must inform you that we shall be unable to publish it.

We thank you for the opportunity of reviewing your manuscript. Sincerely yours,

Henry T. Ricketts, MD

HTR/hs

encls

fecus ago, & fining for from your from your show you want for from your from your form the file a missoners from about our proper on a comments of subsection which is

November 4, 1974

Henry T. Ricketts, M.D. American Medical Association 535 North Dearborn Street Chicago, Ill. 60610

Dear Dr. Ricketts,

Having had the pleasure of meeting you many years ago, and finding you a thousuph going scholar, I was more than surprised to hear from you what I believe to be a misconception about our paper on a coronary risk screening exercise, recently submitted to JAMA. It is in no sense a classical "laboratory experiment", but an introduction to screening and risk detection, it's concepts, which provides an unexcelled concentration of ideas on chronic disease prevention and statistics — usually very dull business and often rejected by students. I can certainly accept with no trouble that the JAMA might not be interested in this paper, generally or specifically, but can express my unhappiness, I hope, at the apparently superficial nature of the review process and the opinionated estimate about this effort based on a generic idea of inefficient ways of training.

The opinion really appeared to have been given without a reading of the manuscript or an understanding of the effort. We are submitting the paper elsewhere, but as a former editor, (with Howard Burchell on <u>Circulation</u>), I believe that editors, in their infinite power, should be called to task on occasion when their contribution to the review process and their comprehension appears to have been less than infinite.

Cordially,

Henry Blackburn, M.D.

HB/kn

pc A. Moser

December 9, 1974

Dr. George V. Mann Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Div. of Nutrition Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Dear George:

I'll sign off. Our correspondence is unhealthy; my intentions were honorable in opening it with admiration of your Progress article.

No claims are made for remarkable ideas or researches but I do enclose the list of research projects on-going here, for your interest. The testing of important hypotheses in generally well-designed clinical trials may not be your cup of tea but it is a logical outgrowth of prior observations and has nothing to do with an entrenched protective posture which you think I have.

If you really consider Morris' work as definitive, rather than simply consistent with a protective effect of exercise, and think it adequately accounts for confounding variables, then you may have real problems evaluating epidemiological evidence. Also, if you had had the courtesy to peruse rather than return peremptorily the opinions and observations I sent you, you would have seen that I shared your criticism of the Finnish Hospitals' Study.

I still hope you will listen one day to one person, who tells you openly that you may have some problems of evaluating certain types of evidence. Of course, this observations comes from one who is much less sure of himself, and of passing scientific and moral judgments on others, than are you.

Cordially,

Henry Blackburn, M.D.

July Warm