
From: Daniel W. Simmons [mailto:dws@wob.nf.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2008 9:58 AM
To: Sandra Chaytor
Subject: RE: hello

Heather is working on it and I will pass them on as soon as they are available.

Regards,
Dan

From: Sandra Chaytor [mailto:schaytor@cihrt.nl.ca]
Sent: August-26-08 9:50 AM
To: Daniel W. Simmons
Subject: RE: hello

Dan,

As originally requested, please provide the names of the 22. Thanks.

Sandy

From: Daniel W. Simmons [mailto:dws@wob.nf.ca]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2008 2:00 PM
To: Sandra Chaytor
Subject: RE: hello

Sandy,

Heather explains it as follows:

“The 13 patients were patients who were diagnosed with breast cancer and were considered ER/PR negative. Because of that Tamoxifen was not in their treatment plan at that time. Upon retesting of that original specimen there was a change which would cause them to be considered positive now. When the panel reviewed their charts it was determined that during the time period between the original test and the retest, **they had been diagnosed with a recurrence/ metastases which was then treated with tamoxifen.** So from a “categorizing” point of view they would be in the group with no recommendations, however it was clear from the conversation at the panel table that earlier treatment with Tamoxifen may have had an impact.

The other 9 were patients were also diagnosed with breast cancer and were considered ER/PR negative and again Tamoxifen was not in their treatment plan at that time. Upon retesting of that original specimen there was a change which would cause them to be considered positive now. When the panel reviewed their charts it was determined that during the time period between the original test and the retest **their disease had progressed**, not I guess significantly enough to warrant being placed on adjuvant therapy, but enough that the clinicians around the table discussed that the lack of Tamoxifen may have had an impact. From a “categorizing” point of view they would be in the group with a recommendation for treatment.”

Regards,
Dan

CIHRT Exhibit P-2618 Page 2

From: Sandra Chaytor [mailto:schaytor@cihrt.nl.ca]
Sent: August-22-08 12:22 PM
To: Daniel W. Simmons
Subject: RE: hello

Yes, please follow-up. That would be quite helpful.

Also could you have Heather explain the distinction between the 13 and the 9? What does it mean that the disease had progressed in the 9? Did they have more than one ER/PR test conducted prior to the re-testing at Mount Sinai?

Thanks again,

Sandy

From: Daniel W. Simmons [mailto:dws@wob.nf.ca]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2008 12:14 PM
To: Sandra Chaytor
Subject: RE: hello

Thanks, Sandy, I did enjoy the time off.

Heather Predham does remember a call from Marilyn McCormack after she sent the breakdown of retest results to the Department, but does not recall any detail of what they discussed about the patients who were most impacted by changes in test results.

From looking back at the table Heather prepared on August 11 (P-1447) she thinks it is most likely that Ms. McCormack questioned her about which groups were likely to be most greatly impacted and that Heather identified two groups. One was the 13 who had changed from negative to positive, who had not been placed on tamoxifen for their original disease, but who had been placed on tamoxifen because they had developed metastatic disease before the retesting. The other was the 9 who had a change from negative to positive, for whom the panel recommended that they be placed on tamoxifen and whose disease had progressed in the interim. These 22 patients were ones with changed results who had not received tamoxifen when they otherwise might have and whose disease had progressed. While it is impossible to say whether their disease would or would not have progressed had they received tamoxifen earlier, Heather says that she would have identified them as the ones with the greatest likelihood of having been impacted.

Heather says that she cannot put her hands immediately on a list of the 13 and 9. It may be among her materials. Alternatively it may be able to be reconstructed. Do you want us to follow up?

Regards,
Dan

From: Sandra Chaytor [mailto:schaytor@cihrt.nl.ca]
Sent: August-18-08 11:48 AM
To: Daniel W. Simmons
Cc: Virginia Connors; Bernard Coffey
Subject: hello

Hi Dan,

Trust you had a good vacation despite the weather.

Could you please ask Heather Predham the following for us:

In the August 18, 2006 Briefing Note for the Premier/ Cabinet Secretariat, how were the 22 people noted to have been impacted identified? What criteria was used? Also, please provide a list of their names.

9/16/2008

Thanks.
Regards,
Sandy

Sandra R. Chaytor, Q.C.
Co-Counsel
Commission of Inquiry on Hormone Receptor Testing
50 Tiffany Lane
St. John's, NL A1A 4H7
Tel. (709) 729-0297
Fax. (709) 729-1525
[*schaytor@cihrt.nl.ca*](mailto:schaytor@cihrt.nl.ca)