In vitro experiments with fibres

	<i>Dosage used</i>		<i>Observations after 24 months exposure 5 h/day; 5 days/week</i>
<i>Reference</i>	<i>Mass</i>	<i>Fibre number</i>	
<i>The experiments carried out</i>			
MMVF10 (2)	30 mg/m ³	232 f/ml	Wagner PGS 2.5 to 3
MMVF11 (2)	30 mg/m ³	246 f/ml	Wagner PGS 2.5 to 3
RCF (2)	30 mg/m ³	187 f/ml	Wagner PGS 4 Lung tumours 16 (13.0%) Mesothelioma 2 (1.6%)
Aramid (3)	Not stated	100 f/ml	Fibrosis and cystic keratinising squamous tumours
Chrysotile (2)	10 mg/m ³	10 600 f/ml	Wagner PGS 4 Lung tumours 13 (18%) Mesothelioma 1 (1.4%)
<i>The experiment that was never carried out</i>			
Chrysotile	0.18 mg/m ³	200 f/ml	?

Wagner PGS = Wagner Pathology Grading Scale as follows: Cellular changes 1 normal; 2 minimal: macrophage response; 3 mild: inflammation, bronchiolisation. Fibrosis 4 minimal: minimal fibrosis; 5 mild: linking fibrosis; 6 moderate: consolidation; 7 severe: marked fibrosis and consolidation; 8 severe: complete obstruction of most airways.

Environmental Health Sciences workshop on fibre toxicology indicates that "A major failing of past experimental studies has been the use of mass as the main dose parameter. Data are needed on fibre comparison by fiber number... Most studies using fibers in vitro have in the past expressed dosage on the basis of fiber mass as opposed to number of fibers per cell, which now appears to be a more valid means of comparison of fiber effects in relation to their potential to cause human disease."

Without going further into the details of the dosages used and the results reported, these studies indicate that the time has come to revisit the case of chrysotile asbestos, and to compare its health related effects with those of other man made fibres, with fibre number at comparable dosage for comparisons. Some surprises might be revealed from such a comprehensive re-examination of the data. A major international re-evaluation of the case of chrysotile asbestos is in order.

JACQUES DUNNIGAN
University of Sherbrooke,
Sherbrooke (Québec),
Canada J1K 2R1.

- Liddell FDK, McDonald AD, McDonald JC. The 1891-20 birth cohort of Quebec chrysotile miners and millers: a preliminary report on mortality to 1988. *9th International Symposium, Epidemiology in Occupational Health, Cincinnati, September 1992.*
- Hesterberg TW, Miller WC, McConnell EE, Chevalier J, Hadley JG, Bernstein DM, Thevenaz P, Anderson R. Chronic inhalation toxicity of size-separated glass fibers in

Fischer 344 rats. *Fund Appl Toxicol* 464-476.

- International Labour Office. *Safety in the use of mineral and synthetic fibres*. Geneva; ILO, 1990. (Occupational Safety and Health Series No 64.)
- Palekar LD, Most BM, Coffin DL. Significance of mass and number of fibers in the correlation of V79 cytotoxicity with tumorigenic potential of mineral fibers. *Environ Res* 1988;46:142-52.
- Coffin DL, Cook PM, Creason JP. Relative mesothelioma induction in rats by mineral fibers: comparison with residual pulmonary mineral fiber number and epidemiology. *Inhal Toxicol* 1992;4:273-300.
- Dement JM. Overview: workshop on fiber toxicology-research needs. *Environ Health Perspect* 1990;88:261-8.

Pulmonary effects of exposure to fine fibreglass: irregular opacities and small airways obstruction

Sir,—On behalf of the North American Insulation Manufacturers Association (NAIMA), I am writing to express our concern over the publication of an article by Kilburn *et al* (1992;49:714-20) that examined a group of fibreglass workers at an appliance manufacturing plant in Cicero, Illinois. The study concluded that "commercial rotary spun fibreglass used for insulating appliances appears to produce human disease that is similar to asbestosis."

The fact is that the conclusion of Kilburn *et al* is incorrect; fibreglass has not been found to produce human disease similar to asbestosis. Kilburn *et al* reached their conclusion despite several factors in their study that point to other culprits. For

example, at least 40% of the workers with positive findings had known exposure to asbestos. In fact, the levels of airborne asbestos reported to Kilburn *et al* by the plant were higher than the levels of glass fibres, and yet were not even considered by Kilburn *et al* in reaching their conclusion. Further, about 80% of the study participants with positive findings were current or former smokers. Finally, the x ray film and pulmonary changes Kilburn *et al* reported as abnormal are actually consistent with those that other scientists have reported to be expected in this age and type of population.

NAIMA would like to point out that the findings of Kilburn *et al* are not consistent with other morbidity studies regarding the health effects of exposure to fibreglass. Recently, Weill of Tulane University Medical School completed a study of over 1250 current workers at five US manufacturing plants. Weill concluded that "...after 10 years of these investigations, we have failed to demonstrate any adverse effect of MMMF [glass fibre] exposure on respiratory health. We have found workers in this industry to be generally healthy, without any detectable evidence of occupationally induced respiratory disease."

NAIMA joins our European colleagues in support of the existing body of scientific research that finds no cause and effect relation between exposure to fibreglass and lung disease or cancer in humans. Based on the current weight of scientific evidence, NAIMA remains confident that fibreglass products are safe to manufacture and install when the simple instructions outlined on product packages are followed.

KENNETH MENTZER
NAIMA, 44 Canal Center Plaza,
Suite 310, Alexandria, VA, USA.

Authors' reply

Sir,—We appreciate the opportunity to respond to Mentzer. His concern is well founded and NAIMA should be worried about the adverse human health effects of commercial rotary spun fibreglass.¹ Controverting the traditional fibre industry position he places the entire causal responsibility for abnormalities in the fibreglass workers on asbestos; not neglecting, of course, the contribution of cigarette smoking. He argues disingenuously that 40% of our workers with

positive findings had "possible" asbestos exposure. Obviously the message should be turned around, 60% of workers with positive chest x ray films were exposed only to fibreglass. They had no asbestos exposure.

The issue of airborne asbestos fibres seems to be a convenient invention to divert attention from fibreglass. Rather the key health problem is the finding that 49% to 83% of fibres in the fibreglass being used at Cicero were respirable but below detectability by phase contrast microscopy.

That 80% of workers with irregular opacities on chest x ray films had smoked cigarettes is analogous to the usual industrial or construction cohort exposed to asbestos. As cigarette smoking by itself does not cause irregular opacities,² it is plausible to suggest that it is synergistic with fibreglass just as it is for asbestos, and that it enhances the fibre induced irregular opacities.

There are few comparative studies of chest x ray films and pulmonary function in industrial populations who have not been exposed to any asbestos but to contend that they are characterised by this degree of function impairment is ludicrous.³ We recommended before that the subjects of studies referred to but not referenced by Mentzer be investigated by independent scientists for exposure to asbestos or to man made fibres.

We examined and reported irregular opacities and small airway obstruction in one cohort of five fibreglass manufacturing plants studied by Weill *et al.*⁴ The atmosphere was continuously contaminated with asbestos during dismantling, repair, and construction of fibreglass production lines. Thus we find the statement attributed to Weill, of no abnormalities, incomprehensible.

The final series of Mentzer's statements are reminiscent of the position of the asbestos industry from the 1930s to the 1960s despite the compelling evidence of asbestosis, cancer, and mesothelioma provided by Merewether,⁵ Dreessen *et al.*,⁶ Doll,⁷ Wagner *et al.*,⁸ Newhouse and Thompson,⁹ and Selikoff *et al.*¹⁰ Society has learned in this century that such views by industry of human risk reflect concerns for corporate comfort and survival, not the safety and health of human beings. Must we repeat the whole sad asbestos litany for man made mineral fibres?

KAYE H KILBURN

DANIEL POWERS

RAPHAEL H WARSHAW

Laboratory for Environmental Sciences,
University of Southern California School of
Medicine, 2025, Zonal Avenue, CSC 201,
Los Angeles, California 90033, USA.

1 Kilburn KH, Powers D, Warshaw RH. Pulmonary effects of exposure

to fine fibreglass: irregular opacities and small airways obstruction. *Br J Ind Med* 1992;49:714-20.

2 Kilburn KH, Lillis R, Anderson HA, Miller A, Warshaw RH. Interaction of asbestos, age and cigarette smoking in producing radiographic evidence of diffuse pulmonary fibrosis. *Am J Med* 1986;80:377-381.

3 Kilburn KH, Warshaw RH. Difficulties of attribution of effect in workers exposed to fiberglass and asbestos. *Am J Ind Med* 1991;20:745-51.

4 Weill H, Hughes JM, Hammad YY, *et al.* Respiratory health in workers exposed to man-made vitreous fibers. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1983;128:104-12.

5 Merewether ERA. *Annual report of the chief inspector of factories*. London: HM Stationery Office, 1947.

6 Dreessen WC, Dallavalle JM, Edwards TI, *et al.* A study of asbestosis in the asbestos textile industry. *Public Health Bull* 1938;241:1-147.

7 Doll R. Mortality from lung cancer in asbestos workers. *Br J Ind Med* 1955;12:81-6.

8 Wagner JC, Sleggs CA, Marchand P. Diffuse pleural mesothelioma and asbestos exposure in the North Western Cape Province. *Br J Ind Med* 1960;17:260-71.

9 Newhouse ML, Thompson H. Mesothelioma of pleura and peritoneum following exposure to asbestos in the London area. *Brit J Ind Med* 1965;22:261-9.

10 Selikoff IJ, Hammond EC, Seidman H. Mortality experiences of insulation workers in the United States and Canada, 1943-1976. *Ann NY Acad Sci* 1979;3301:91-116.