

From: Arden Pope <cap3@byu.edu>

Sent: Friday, June 30, 2017 1:29 PM

To: jenstrom@ucla.edu

Cc: Mike Jerrett <Jerrett@berkeley.edu>; Michelle Turner <michelle.turner@isglobal.org>; Ryan Diver <ryan.diver@cancer.org>; Daniel Krewski <dkrewski@uottawa.ca>; Susan Gapstur <susan.gapstur@cancer.org>; Rick Burnett <Rick.Burnett@hc-sc.gc.ca>; ACohen <acohen@healtheffects.org>; Dan Greenbaum <DGreenbaum@healtheffects.org>

Subject: RE: Response to Dr. James Enstrom

June 30, 2017

Dear Dr. Enstrom,

We are writing in response to the requests you sent to Drs. Cohen, Krewski, Pope, and Turner to conduct certain ad hoc analysis of the American Cancer Study (ACS) Cancer Prevention Study II (CPS-II) Cohort.

We also read your paper, "Fine particulate matter and total mortality in Cancer Prevention Study Cohort reanalysis," published recently in *Dose-Response*, and we subsequently submitted responses to *Dose-Response* for publication as letters to the editor. These letters include straightforward feedback and assessment of your paper, and an outline and summary of the various analyses and results regarding air pollution and health outcomes using the ACS CPS-II cohort over the last 20+ years. It is our understanding that you have received these letters and have been invited to respond prior to the publication of our letters.

Briefly, our work to date addresses the fact that the PM_{2.5}-mortality association can be sensitive to the method of exposure assignment in any cohort. That is why we undertook extensive analyses employing different PM_{2.5} national exposure models with the CPS-II cohort data, as summarized in our letter to the editor to *Dose-Response*. Notably, a major strength of those analyses is the use of exposure models with complete coverage of the continental US, thus avoiding having to restrict the cohort to only subjects living near the limited number of ground-based monitors in the Inhalable Particulate Network, a process that artificially induces uncertainty in risk estimates.

We thank you for your interest in our work, and look forward to your response to our letters to the editor of *Dose-Response*.

Sincerely,

C. Arden Pope III
Daniel Krewski
Susan M. Gapstur
Michelle C. Turner
Michael Jerrett
Richard T. Burnett