



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Division of Epidemiology
School of Public Health
1-210 Moos Tower
515 Delaware Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(612) 624-5400
FAX: (612) 625-8950

✓ 11/21 m
Connep-Dwyer

November 20, 1990

Johanna Dwyer, D.Sc.
Professor of Medicine
Tufts University Medical School
750 Washington Street
Boston, MA 02111

Dear Johanna:

It was great to have you visit. You wowed us! The enclosed probably didn't get past Paul and Joan.

Help!

Cordially,

Henry Blackburn, MD
Mayo Professor of Public Health

/nmf
Enclosure



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Division of Epidemiology
School of Public Health
1-210 Moos Tower
515 Delaware Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(612) 624-5400
FAX: (612) 625-8950

✓ 9/12
September 10, 1990

Paul R. Thomas, EdD, RD
National Academy of Sciences
Food and Nutrition Board, Suite 340
2101 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20418

Dear Paul:

These are my running comments on Dietary Guidelines Implementation, Chapter 8, Education of the Public:

The introductory pages are a bit wordy. Lines 8 to 24 on page 8-2 need tightening up of syntax. Page 8.3 continues chatty and could use central editing.

This is very interesting background material but I wonder if two pages on the FDA and Pizza are really necessary.

Pages 8.7, 8.8 are also very interesting and chatty, but my question there is relevance to the task at hand.

The negative tone about labelling and difficulties of interpreting labelling, rather than a positive tone on what is appropriate, feasible and desirable for labelling, are unfortunate. Is not the emphasis on "complexity" an unnecessarily negative approach? Rather, should we focus on the possible, the positive and the feasible?

Philosophizing over "free choice" is questionably appropriate in a document of this sort. If our Committee doesn't understand what education and motivation are toward good nutrition, then we are in trouble indeed. Sixty different yogurts is not the real problem or challenge.

Basically, 16 pages of preamble seem a bit heavy.

The recommendations and the 6 strategies proposed for education are excellent, but I find minimal connection between the 16 page preamble and these strategies.

Strategies and actions, beginning on page 8-18:

Strategy 1. The top paragraph page 8-19 is not very interesting and is probably irrelevant. Action 2 seems a little vague and Action 3 more so.

Strategy 2 is well laid out. The recommendation concerning the NET Program appears reasonable and well presented. Actions 5 and 6 are well taken. Strategy 3 is sound, as is Strategy 4 which finally gets precise. Strategy 5 is needed and sound. Strategy 6 is excellent. I find generally these strategies and action items well thought out and well organized.

Comments on Paul Thomas' summary of the DGI review coordinators' comments:

In point #4 about individual foods for single meals, I would highlight a problem with the original NRC Diet-Health Report. Not only are the recommendations meant to apply to dietary patterns over a period of time, but recommendations should be distinguished between those for individuals and those for the population as a whole. The original report addresses these issues insufficiently. The Implementation Report cannot fail to do so and must not confuse the individual and population goals and recommendations. I recommend that you consider George Beaton's report from WHO (Sushma has it).

Cordially,



Henry Blackburn, MD
Mayo Professor

/nmf

① resp - Dwyer

UNIVERSITY of SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA • SCHOOL of MEDICINE

Department of Preventive Medicine
and
Institute for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Research

James H. Dwyer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

1000 South Fremont • Suite 641
Alhambra, California 91803-1358
(818) 457-4061; FAX 818-457-4100

file Dwyer

December 26, 1990

Henry Blackburn
Division of Epidemiology
School of Public Health
I-210 Moos
515 Delaware Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Henry:

This is the paper I mentioned to you on the phone. Even though the primary outcome of the trial was per cent diameter stenosis, the extraordinary outcome was events. The effect was so dramatic that only a few participants are necessary.

However, the effect on anatomy was small compared to the effect on risk of events. This suggests that changes in anatomy only reflect the mediating mechanism of benefit in an indirect manner. I am currently hypothesizing that change in perfusion may be closer to that mechanism. You may remember the SPECT thallium scans that I showed you at Tahoe. I just have to convince the study section.

Ron Dunton has pursued me with unusual persistence concerning this evaluation at Southern California Edison. We will see what happens.

Best Regards

JH Dwyer
Jim Dwyer