

From: [Heather Predham](#)
To: ["Alteen, Larry";](#)
Subject: RE: ER/PR
Date: October-05-05 8:57:55 AM

HI,

Thanks for your e-mail. This has taken the majority of my waking hours since June I think and I totally appreciate your frustration.

I need your advice though. I was going through the database yesterday evening and after the conference call yesterday I noticed that some of the people whose samples we have sent away have addresses in other regions, such as Grand Falls, Labrador, Deer Lake. Would it be of any benefit to you and the other regions if I sent you their names, other demographics and sample dates? We did do the test but do you think there may be duplication of effort?

I would appreciate your thoughts.

Heather

-----Original Message-----

From: Alteen, Larry [<mailto:LAlteen@cwhc.nl.ca>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2005 10:37 AM
To: Heather Predham
Subject: RE: ER/PR

Thanks Heather,

I do appreciate the seriousness of this issue and I don't think I was offended as much as frustrated after reviewing the charts of the 80+ cases from the old Central West side of our region last night and then after that reading your email. Probably just the lateness of the day. As mentioned this is a significant issue for all of us and I want to avoid placing blame on people versus trying to sort this out for the benefit of our patients/communities. I appreciate your reply.

Larry

-----Original Message-----

From: Heather Predham [<mailto:Heather.Predham@hccsj.nl.ca>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2005 8:09 AM
To: Alteen, Larry

Subject: RE: ER/PR

Hi Dr. Alteen,

Please understand I did not intend my e-mail as anything but a "heads up". I was of the understanding (obviously incorrectly) that your area had not responded to Dr. Cook's request. When I was briefing our insurer, they asked if I would mention this to the risk managers in the two authorities (yours and another). As you can appreciate, this situation has immense potential from the insurer's point of view and they were concerned that any miscommunication could add to it.

This IS a trying time, with a lot of people involved in coordinating activities and information and I obviously made a mistake.

My only intent was to be helpful and I apologize if you have taken any offence.

Heather

-----Original Message-----

From: Alteen, Larry [<mailto:LAlteen@cwhc.nl.ca>]

Sent: Monday, October 03, 2005 11:19 PM

To: Heather Predham

Subject: FW: ER/PR

Hi Heather,

I wanted to respond to your email to Judy regarding our response to Dr. Cook's request. For the record we have responded to his verbal request in June within two weeks and to the September 6th written request within three weeks. This I feel is a quite appropriate turnaround time particularly in view of the fact that it will take months for these specimens to be processed in Mt. Sinai and a report available to us. I feel that the last sentence in your email is not helpful to any of us in this trying time. I have had extensive discussions with Dr. Williams recently regarding this and one of our pathologists, Dr. Maurice Dalton has been communicating with Dr. Cook personally, and as mentioned we always try to comply with the requests from your facility in a timely manner.

Thanks for listening.

Larry Alteen

-----Original Message-----

From: Budgell, Judy
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2005 1:40 PM
To: Alteen, Larry
Cc: Hornell, Jim
Subject: FW: ER/PR

Judy

Judy Budgell
Regional Utilization / Risk Manager
Central Newfoundland Regional Health Centre Site
Central Regional Integrated Health Authority
50 Union Street Grand Falls Windsor A2A 2E2

-----Original Message-----

From: Heather Predham [<mailto:Heather.Predham@hccsj.nl.ca>]
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2005 7:04 AM
To: Budgell, Judy; Susan Sullivan
Subject: RE: ER/PR

Hi,

The Independent ran a story on Sunday....NTV are doing a story tonight...I have to get in contact with all of you about communicating with the surgeons.....later today or tomorrow I'll send you something on what we are doing in case you want to do something similar

Heather

-----Original Message-----

From: Budgell, Judy [<mailto:JBudgell@cwhc.nl.ca>]
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2005 9:46 AM
To: Heather Predham; Susan Sullivan; Budgell, Judy
Subject: RE: ER/PR

Hi Heather,

I have spoken to our VP Medical and he is aware of the issue and has been in a conversation with Bob Williams as of this weekend. It will be discussed

today. Thanks for the information.

Judy

Judy Budgell
Regional Utilization / Risk Manager
Central Newfoundland Regional Health Centre Site
Central Regional Integrated Health Authority
50 Union Street Grand Falls Windsor A2A 2E2

-----Original Message-----

From: Heather Predham [<mailto:Heather.Predham@hccsj.nl.ca>]

Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2005 10:43 AM

To: Susan Sullivan; jbudgell@cwhc.nl.ca

Subject: ER/PR

HI guys,

We have had an issue with our ER/PR testing....this has been the issue that we have been dealing with all summer. ER/PR is estrogen and progesterone receptors and if a person has breast cancer and is positive for these receptors, she gets tamoxifen as a treatment instead of Chemotherapy. She may end up on chemotherapy anyway, but it is felt that Tamoxifen may decrease the metastatic aspects of the breast cancer and has less awful side effects. (I say she but some of our affected patients are hes)

In 1997, a Dako semi-automated/manual system was installed for the Immunohistochemistry Service and replaced the bioassay method of testing for ER/PR receptors. This Dako system was replaced in 2004 by an automated Ventana system. In 2005, a patient, initially tested in 2002 with the Dako system and reported as ER/PR negative, was retested with the Ventana system and now indicated a strong positivity for estrogen and progesterone receptors. Four other patients initially tested as negative in 2002 were also retested, and all tested positive with the Ventana system.

We expanded our retesting to include all samples initially tested as negative in 2002 on the Dako system. Of the 57 retested on the Ventana system, 38 now showed positive results. This high conversion rate was unexpected and then placed the sensitivity of the Ventana System in question.

We have had external reviews done on our Ventana machine, on the pathology side of the service and the technical side. All those reports are pending, but we do have some recommendations that we can implement right

now. Also we have stopped all testing and all requests for testing are being sent to Mt. Sinai. Mt. Sinai are also retesting all the blocks for these years. Results are starting to come in and it looks like we will have to contact up to 200 people to tell them that they were initially tested as negative, but were in fact positive.

Why am I telling you two all this? Well, since June, Dr. Cook our chief of pathology has requested that your two boards send in your blocks to be retested in Mt. Sinai, to no avail. I wanted to give you a heads up as we have to begin to inform people individually about this issue, but the Department of Health wants us to make a public statement. Since your labs have not responded yet to our request, you may be asked about the reasons why.....

What do you think?

Heather