Professor Joshua Lederberg
The Rockefeller University
New York, N Y 10021-6399

AUG -6 1992

Dear Roy

Thank you for sending me your paper on risk/credibility.

I have not been able to give it the close perusal that it deserves and demands; but let me make a few comments anyhow.

1) Yes, the credibility of the model has to be taken account of. But are there not often alternative hypotheses besides linear and sublinear? E.G. a substantial fraction of hypersensitive individuals in the population? Interaction with other pollutants? .... The credibility of those alternatives is generally low absent specific evidence, but may still put quite a spin on your composed risk.

2) What does your analysis have to do with 10^{-6}? That is a policy judgment about level of acceptable hazard, after that has estimated by your or other procedures. It does have to be balanced against imputed benefits (and don't neglect redistributive benefits impacts)

3) I don't follow the argument how standard error of the cancer rate relates to your analysis. If you had the "best possible estimate" that x deaths result from a given exposure, how does the standard error affect your judgment about the tradeoff of those x deaths vs. benefits

Perhaps one could argue that if there is a high background or high S.E., one could more efficiently deploy public health resources elsewhere than to prevent x deaths. But that's a tough occasion as well.

I hope I've not just failed to grasp

Yours.

JR.