Michael J. Miller (appearance *pro hac vice*)
Timothy Litzenburg (appearance *pro hac vice*)
Curtis G. Hoke (State Bar No. 282465)
The Miller Firm, LLC
108 Railroad Ave.
Orange, VA 22960
(540) 672-4224 phone; (540) 672-3055 fax
mmiller@millerfirmllc.com
tlitzenburg@millerfirmllc.com
choke@millerfirmllc.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
DEWAYNE JOHNSON

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DEWAYNE JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

MONSANTO COMPANY

Defendants.

Case No. CGC-16-550128

DECLARATION OF CURTIS G. HOKE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO MONSANTO'S MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 20 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OF GHOSTWRITING

Trial Judge: TBD

Trial Date: June 18, 2018
Time: 9:30 AM
Department: TBD

DECLARATION OF CURTIS G. HOKE

I, Curtis Hoke, declare and state:

1. I am an attorney at law admitted to practice before all of the courts in the state of California. I am an attorney at The Miller Firm, LLC, attorneys of record for Plaintiff Dewayne Johnson. I am over eighteen years of age and am fully competent to make this Declaration in support of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 20 to Exclude Evidence of Ghostwriting. Except as otherwise expressly stated below, I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration, and if called to testify, I could and would competently testify to the matters stated herein.

2. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of portions of the 8/24/2017 hearing transcript in In Re: Roundup Products Liability Cases, MDL 16-02741.

3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit B** is a true and correct copy of the 2/19/15 email of David Saltmiras regarding IARC Planning, MONGLY00977267.

4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit C** is a true and correct copy of portions the Glyphosate Publication Recommendations for Process, MONGLY02598454.

5. Attached hereto as **Exhibit D** is a true and correct copy of the Monsanto Manuscript Clearance Form, MONGLY02117800.

6. Attached hereto as **Exhibit E** is a true and correct copy of the 7/19/2012 email from Mattias Buelig regarding genotox review, MONGLY02145917.

7. Attached hereto as **Exhibit F** is a true and correct copy of the May 11, 2015 Draft of Proposal for Post-IARC Meeting Scientific Projects.

8. Attached hereto as **Exhibit G** is a true and correct copy of the 1/6/2016 email of William Heydens regarding Glyphosate Expert Panel Manuscripts, MONGLY 00999487.

9. Attached hereto as **Exhibit H** is a true and correct copy of the 2/9/2016 email of William Heydens regarding Summary Manuscript Draft, MONGLY01000676.

10. Attached hereto as **Exhibit I** is a true and correct copy of portions of the Expert Witness Report of Warren G. Foster, PhD.

11. Attached hereto as **Exhibit J** is a true and correct copy of portions of the Expert Witness Report of Jay I Goodman.

12. Attached hereto as **Exhibit K** is a true and correct copy of the 3/24/2017 letter from European Parliament.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 7, 2018 in Orange, Virginia.

By: _____
Curtis G. Hoke,
Declarant

EXHIBIT A

Pages 1 - 102

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Vince Chhabria, Judge

IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION,) NO. M. 16-02741 VC

San Francisco, California
Thursday, August 24, 2017

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs:

The Miller Firm LLC
108 Railroad Avenue
Orange, VA 22960
(540) 672-4224
(540) 672-3055 (fax)
BY: MICHAEL J. MILLER
NANCY GUY MILLER

For Plaintiffs:

Andrus Wagstaff PC
7171 West Alaska Drive
Lakewood, CO 80226
(720) 255-7623
BY: AIMEE H. WAGSTAFF

For Plaintiffs:

Andrus Wagstaff PC
6315 Ascot Drive
Oakland, CA 94611
(720) 255-7623
BY: KATHRYN MILLER FORGIE

For Plaintiffs:

Weitz & Luxenberg PC
700 Broadway
New York, NY 10003
(213) 558-5802
BY: ROBIN L. GREENWALD

Reported By: Lydia Zinn, CSR No. 9223, FCRR, Official Reporter

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- internal e-mails are not --

THE COURT: But --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- reliable scientific data.

THE COURT: But the internal e-mails reflect that Monsanto has been ghostwriting reports. And those reports have been portrayed as independent. And you -- I mean, your whole presentation thus far has been about how all the independent science supports a conclusion that glyphosate doesn't cause non-Hodgkin's lymphoma.

So, you know, I don't understand how you could have taken the position that the issue of Monsanto drafting reports for allegedly independent experts on whether glyphosate causes non-Hodgkin's lymphoma could be irrelevant to the question of whether there's evidence that glyphosate causes non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. I just don't understand how you could take that position.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It's because that -- the reports that you're referring to, I think, are two reports in the literature, Your Honor. They're not -- they are not scientific studies. They're not reports on scientific studies. They're reports known as "surveys"; literature surveys. That -- that's the technical characterization of those reports.

Those aren't original science. They aren't the original reports of the 14 animal studies that are at issue here. They aren't the original reports by the epidemiologists who have

done observational studies; both case-controlled and -- and prospective epidemiology. They aren't the original reports of those authors. And for that reason, they're not relevant under a *Daubert* -- in a *Daubert* context. That's the basis for our statement.

THE COURT: So that sort of invokes another question for me, which is, you know, Phase One of this case is about whether there is enough to go to the jury on the question whether Roundup is capable of causing non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. Right? And we've --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, that's not exactly right, Your Honor, with all due respect.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Phase One of this inquiry is whether or not the expert-witness testimony that the plaintiffs have that Monsanto -- that glyphosate can cause cancer is reliable, and based on sound, reliable, scientific evidence that's relevant.

THE COURT: Right, but if there is enough reliable evidence to go to the jury, then we get past Phase One. Right?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, if there is enough reliable evidence to support an expert witness' opinion --

THE COURT: Mm-hm.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- they would -- they may get by the first phase, possibly.

THE COURT: Okay. And so --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't think that's going to happen, but --

THE COURT: Right, but --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So --

THE COURT: And so we have to look at what everyone is saying; what everyone in the scientific community is saying about the question whether Roundup causes non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. Right?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I don't think that's the inquiry specifically, Your Honor. There --

THE COURT: Well, I mean, if one of their plaintiffs' experts came up and testified, and didn't mention some paper on the ability of Roundup to cause non-Hodgkin's lymphoma that was in your favor, no doubt you would cross-examine them on their failure to consider that paper. Yes?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: We might if it's original science.

If it's a review article, which is what I think you're referring to from the -- from the information we've seen on ghostwriting, which, by the way, I disagree with. I don't think it's correct. I don't think it's a correct characterization of what went on there. It's become very popular in the media, thanks to these guys, but --

THE COURT: Well, Monsanto --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- and I guess your Honor's been influenced by it, but --

THE COURT: Well, wait a minute. It's Monsanto that used the term "ghostwriting."

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, yes.

THE COURT: So you're saying that Monsanto mischaracterized what it was doing --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes --

THE COURT: -- when it was drafting these reports?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, I think that Monsanto was --

THE COURT: I haven't been tricked --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- loosely using the word "ghostwriting."

THE COURT: I haven't been tricked by the plaintiffs. I've apparently been tricked by Monsanto when Monsanto internally referred to what it was doing as "ghostwriting."

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, the ghostwriting memos, Your Honor, don't refer to any original science. Okay?

What they refer to is review articles done by groups of -- of -- of --

THE COURT: Independent scientists?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- professors, and independent people, and oftentimes consultants. That goes on. I'll admit that. Okay?

But what it does not -- what none of those documents refer to is any original science. The original path. reports from these 14 studies; the original scientific evidence that is going to have to form the basis for an expert witness' opinion.

That's why all of the e-mails that Your Honor looked at in these -- in this 30-page, carefully drawn exhibit that Mr. Wisner says he spent hundreds of hours on are irrelevant to the *Daubert* inquiry. None of those things are going to go into evidence; at least, they wouldn't go into evidence in the Eighth Circuit or the Tenth Circuit or the Eleventh Circuit to support --

They can go into evidence. Anything can go into a *Daubert* hearing. That's what Rule 104 says.

But they won't be able to legitimately support an expert witness' opinion. I don't think that -- I don't think that any solid expert is going to rely on review papers, or what Monsanto's internal folks are saying in e-mails just to come up with a reliable basis for his expert opinion.

THE COURT: Monsanto has --

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: His or her expert-witness opinion.

THE COURT: Monsanto has made a number of filings in this case since it began. And in a number of filings it has made statements to the effect of, you know, *There's no evidence to support the conclusion that Roundup causes non-Hodgkin's*

EXHIBIT B

HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]

From: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2015 4:01 PM
To: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]
Cc: KOCH, MICHAEL S [AG/1000]; HODGE-BELL, KIMBERLY C [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: IARC Planning

Bill et al.,

I had an extended chat with Roger this afternoon, as is the custom. He said that Critical Reviews has already dedicated some significant space to the glyphosate topic, especially the pending issue #3 with both the carc paper & Kier paper. However, to the contrary, he did say he'd consider something along the lines of the 1, 3 – butadiene issue... I think we would have to prepare a very compelling story.

David Saltmiras, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.
Science Fellow
Novel Chemistry and Microbials Product Lead
Toxicology and Nutrition Center
Monsanto
[redacted]

From: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2015 7:53 AM
To: FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]
Cc: KOCH, MICHAEL S [AG/1000]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; HODGE-BELL, KIMBERLY C [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: IARC Planning

Donna,

Per our phone call with John the other day, the next two most important things that we need to do are the Meta-analysis publication and the Ag Health Study Follow-up publication, assuming we can get our hands on the data in a reasonable timeframe. I feel confident that we will have organizational support for doing these projects, so I think we need to start setting them up now.

For the meta-analysis, please contact Elizabeth, let her know we would like her/Ellen to do this, and get a cost estimate from her.

For the AHS data, I heard 2 action items during our call: first - get with the lawyers to initiate the FOI process; second - contact Tom Sorohan and get him lined up to do the analysis when we get the data; also, get a cost estimate from him.

For the overall plausibility paper that we discussed with John (where he gave the butadiene example), I'm still having a little trouble wrapping my mind around that. If we went full-bore, involving experts from all the major areas (Epi, Tox, Genetox, MOA, Exposure - not sure who we'd get), we could be pushing $250K or maybe even more. A less expensive/more palatable approach might be to involve experts only for the areas of contention, epidemiology and possibly MOA (depending on what comes out of the IARC meeting), and we ghost-write the Exposure Tox & Genetox sections. An option would be to add Greim and Kier or Kirkland to have their names on the publication, but we would be keeping the cost down by us doing the writing and they would just edit & sign their names so to speak. Recall that is how we handled Williams Kroes & Munro, 2000.

EXHIBIT C

Glyphosate Publications
Recommendations for Process

Final Product:

- Two Manuscripts: one Mammalian Toxicology, one Ecotoxicology
    - Comprehensive in scope
    - But more emphasis placed on main issues (NCAP) and other important potential problem areas (e.g. Neurotoxicity)
- Only minimal, if any, delay; Ensures high quality manuscripts
- Less CanTox involvement, and thus, less $$$$

Steps:

1. Prepare Rough Outline of Manuscripts

- WHO: Monsanto Scientists (leads - Heydens, McKee, Wratten)
- WHEN: A.S.A.P.

2. CanTox Reference Document

- WHO: Monsanto Scientists (leads - Heydens, McKee, Wratten)
- WHAT:
    - Not a total rewrite - Fix errors & *major* problems
    - Re-arrange document according to outline of manuscripts
    - Eliminate any 'bad' parts
- WHEN: Completed 3 weeks prior to expert meeting - 1st or 2nd week of November if meeting is held in December
- Note: Reference Document has value. Monsanto will further refine reference document later for internal use and use with KIPs/experts outside Monsanto

MONGLY02598454

Glyphosate Publications
Recommendations for Process (cont'd)

3. Write Draft Manuscripts

- WHO:
    - Mammalian Tox: lead - Heydens
    - Ecotoxicology: lead - McKee or Ulysses
        - Mike's time commitment on Cr3B2 is currently a significant competing factor
        - Mike thinks Ulysses can produce acceptable 1st draft with Mike's guidance & input
        - If Ulysses, more $$$ needed for CanTox
        - Note: 'Beneficial Insects' & 'Shallow Water' issues not resolvable in this manuscript

- WHEN:
    - Start ASAP (WFH ~ October 12; MJM ?)
    - Completion?

- PROCESS: Manuscripts sent to Ian for editing by him; he sends to Experts

4. Meeting with Experts

- WHEN: In 1999 if at all possible - December 6-9 last chance

- Note: Monsanto scientists will meet individually with Experts prior to meeting as necessary to ensure familiarity with and understanding of data

MONGLY02598455

Glyphosate Publications
Recommendations for Process

2. Meeting with Experts

- WHAT: 2-3 day meeting as planned previously
- WHEN: Possibly early December, more likely mid- to late January

MONGLY02598456

CanTox Glyphosate Background Document
Comments / Recommendations
September 30, 1999

Section 3.1.1 (pp. 14-26)

- This section is an enumeration of fate & transport data with NO CONCLUSIONS.
- Need summary to help reader

Exposure section, pp. 26-61

- VERY CUMBERSOME and not necessary for mammalian tox. reviewers.
- Refer them to summary section/Tables so they don't waste time.

Use of "Worst Case" & "Reasonable Worst Case"

- Seem to be used interchangeably - use one or other
- Analysis is scewed toward worst case so advise using this term, not "Reasonable"
    - use of "Worst Case" supported by statement near bottom of p.61 (2nd-to-last paragraph)
- What is definition of "Reasonable Worst Case" ?

Section 3.2.5 - Total Exposures from All Pathways, pp. 63-66

This is the summary section for exposures and is the most important because it may be all that most people read. Therefore, it would be valuable to add some information on what important assumptions were used for all important routes of exposure. Two examples are:

Food residues

"There was no adjustment for market share."

Glyphosate Acute - Female Preschool Child

Drinking water - 45 ug/l "...is the highest values reported in the literature. Sprayed at maximum rate in area where topsoil was removed."

4.0 HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Introductory paragraph, p.76

- Needs to be 'harder-hitting' summary sentence.

4.1.1 Metabolism and Pharmacokinetics Section, pp. 76-79

- Summary paragraph (last par. on p. 76/1st par. on p. 77) needs improvement.

MONGLY02598457

- Last paragraph on p. 78 overemphasizes transport to bone. This was already highlighted in preceding paragraphs. Suggest deleting this study because:
    - study was only done to demonstrate adequacy of dosing for in vivo cytogenetics study
    - there is no human exposure i.p.
- p. 79, 2nd full paragraph - this is somewhat redundant and doesn't fit where presented. Suggest moving to bottom p.77/top p. 88 OR combining with par. 2 on p. 77.

4.1.2.1, Subchronic Toxicity Studies, p. 82

- As done in other sections, a summary of subchronic findings should be added.
    - in rodents, only see significant effects at/above 25,000 ppm
        - most signficant was decreased B.W. gain
            - probably due to increased food intake
        - no organ weight toxicity (would have to position salivary gland lesion)
    - in dogs, no tox up to 2,000 mg/kg/day
    - overall, no significant toxic effects noted in subchronic studies conducted up to very high dose levels, doses which are orders of magnitude higher than human exposure

Salivary gland lesion explanation, pp. 83-84

- Paragraph contains the basic elements but could be 'beefed-up' and clarified somewhat.
- Alternatively, simply state in text of document that lesions do not appear to be related to b-adrenergic mechanism. Then, include Chuck's evaluation of this as an Appendix for those who want more information.

1-Yr dog study, p. 84

- Should this be moved to 'Chronic' section?
- How should we handle Ag. Canada's conclusion of possible effect in epididymides (lymphoid lesions) with lower NOEL (100 mg/kgday vs. 500 mg/kg/day for EPA.
    - Add WHO IPCS conclusion?

Subchronic tox. studies with POEA, pp. 86,87

- Add short paragraph saying that subchronic studies have beenconducted with dogs and rats. The only significant finding was the inability of animals to tolerate relatively high concentrations of surfactant in their diet. This is not surprising for a surfactant material which, by nature of what it is designed to do - surface-active properties - is designed to perturb membranes. This is consistent with theirritating properties found in the acute eye and skin irritation studies.

Oncogenicity study results, pp. 88-89

The following non-treatment related increases in tumors were highlighted:

- Rat study #1: testes interstitial cell (high dose),
  thyroid C-cell (high dose males)

MONGLY02598458

- Rat study #2: pancreatic islet cell (high dose males),
  thyroid-Cell (mid & high dose females)
- Mouse study: renal tubule adenomas (high dose males)
- Taken together, don't look good.
- This will ultimately go away when all other chronics done for EU get released to public showing no tumor effects.
- *NOTE: THE RAT PANCREAS, LIVER(??) AND THYROID TUMORS ARE HIGHLIGHTED BY* ***NCAP***

4.1.3, Genotoxicity, p. 90-92

- First 2 paragraphs seem out of place - don't fit in well. Delete or move further back with editing to make them fit in place. We originally suggested the 'disclaimer', but it has been modified to the point where it doesn't work well.
- Last sentence: In view of … should be considered NON-mutagenic.

MONGLY02598459

EXHIBIT D

Monsanto Manuscript Clearance Form
Global Regulatory

***NOTE**: this form needs to be completed and submitted for review at least 4 weeks prior to manuscript submission and a minimum of 2 weeks prior to abstract/presentation submission*

Questions regarding completion of this form can be directed to Jeanna Graf (4-2011) or Kevin Glenn (4-4242)

Date: 2/29/2012

Please indicate type of publication: ☒ Manuscript ☐ Conference/meeting presentation ☐ Abstract

Has this information been publicly disclosed previously? ☐ No ☒ Yes If yes, where & when? This manuscript reviews glyphosate genotoxicity publications since the Williams et al. (2000) review

(If the information has previously been published, no need to include Patent Scientist & Patent Atty review)

Title: Review of Genotoxicity of Glyphosate and Glyphosate Based Formulations

Author(s): David Saltmiras, Larry Kier (consultant)

Author Handling Correspondence: David Saltmiras **Mail Zone:** C1NA **Phone:** 4-8856

Is this related to a Monsanto collaboration? ☐ No ☒ Yes If yes, Other

Meeting Date & Location at which Manuscript will be presented:

Journal Submitted To: Reg. Toxicol. Pharmacol.

Lead Author's Comments: (Please provide information on **purpose of presentation/publication** and any relevant patents or manuscript disclosures.) This manuscript provide a comprehensive quality check on the large number of genotoxicity publications on glyphosate since the Williams et al. (2000) glyphosate toxicology review manuscript. This work falls under the scope of the EU Glyphosate Task Force and will be a valuable resource in future product defense against claims that glyphosate is mutagenic or genotoxic.

Title: Review of Genotoxicity of Glyphosate and Glyphosate Based Formulations

Author Material Transfer Agreement Statement: (Please refer questions to a patent attorney.) I have reviewed the material transfer and data disclosure requirements of the proposed journal and have discussed any such requirements with my direct supervisor. I ensure that when I submit this manuscript, the journal either does not or will not in this instance require Monsanto to provide restricted plasmids or other materials referenced in our manuscript, or that I will obtain legal approval for any such materials prior to submission of this paper.

I have reviewed that the appropriate individuals that have contributed substantial, direct, intellectual work to this manuscript/presentation are included as authors, and other significant contributors have been appropriately acknowledged.

REQUESTOR'S SIGNATURE: _____

Reviewer: Please review, sign, and return.		
Reviewer	**Approval Signature**	**Date**
Program Lead, Tech Center John Vicini, C1NA, (W.Blackden)		3/9/2012
Center Lead * Nordine Cheikh, C3NA, (J.Graf)		
Regulatory Team Lead (Crop/Chem) Chemistry; Susan Martino-Catt C3NA (L. Billadeau)		
Crop/ChemTeam Lead Not Applicable		
Regulatory Law Not Applicable **Regulatory Law (Add'l Reviewer)** Brandon Neuschafer, E1NH (J. Wardlow)		
Regulatory Scientific Affairs Eric Sachs, C3NA, (J. Graf)		
Biotechnology Not Applicable		
Patent Scientist Not Applicable **Patent Scientist (Add'l Reviewer)** Not Applicable		
Patent Attorney Not Applicable **Patent Attorney (Add'l Reviewer)** Not Applicable		
Regulatory Regional Lead ** Not Applicable		
Additional Reviewer: Other:		

Requestor must send an email message as well as the manuscript clearance form to the administrative assistant of the selected Lead.

***Center Lead**: Please add any other Program Leads that should be included in the review process, and choose "not applicable" for any reviewers that should not be included.

****To be selected when involving samples / data from regional investigators.

Requestor must first collate all the signed pages and then send them to Gracie Williams, BB1B (Chesterfield Valley).

Monsanto Manuscript Clearance Reviewer Guidelines Form
Global Regulatory

Reviewers: *Please complete your review of this manuscript within 7 working days (abstract/presentation) and 21 working days (publication/manuscript). If timely review is not possible, please communicate this to the lead author within 2 – 3 days of receipt of this MCF indicating a delegate within your organization that can perform the review. Also, please note, reviews are being completed* ***concurrently****, not sequentially.*

Program Lead, Tech Center (TC)
Determine if this is the first TC publication on this trait or MON # and that the publication follows past TC practices with earlier Monsanto publications. Ensure that the scientific conclusions (e.g. of compositional equivalence, natural variability) are justified by presented data. Ensure that individuals that have contributed substantial, direct, intellectual work to this manuscript are included as authors and other significant contributions are appropriately acknowledged.

Center Lead
Determine that the scientific conclusions are clearly stated and supported by the data. Review assessment of the TC Program Lead (if available). Determine if other TC representatives need to review and provide additional scientific insights and input. Ensure that individuals that have contributed substantial, direct, intellectual work to this manuscript are included as authors and other significant contributions are appropriately acknowledged.

Regulatory Team Lead (Crop/Chem)
Ensure that descriptions of MOA, product concepts, etc. are consistent with Product Core Team (PCT) standards, any prior Biotechnology communications, submission documents, etc. Ensure that the manuscript is consistent with the Regulatory and Biotechnology publication strategy.

Crop/Chem Team Lead
Ensure that descriptions of MOA, product concepts, etc. are consistent with any prior Biotechnology communications, PCT standards or submissions of trait or MON #. Ensure that the manuscript is consistent with the Regulatory and Biotechnology publication strategy. Confirm that publication contains no comparative assessments or statements between different MONs and that any reference to other MONs is accurate and consistent with prior communications.

Regulatory Law
Ensure that publication of MON # (or other invention) is legal and does not compromise Monsanto FTO.

Regulatory Scientific Affairs
Ensure that descriptions of MOA, product concepts are consistent with prior communications of trait or MON #. Ensure that the manuscript is consistent with the Regulatory and Biotechnology publication strategy. Ensure that any policy statements or implications are consistent with both Regulatory strategies and scientific outreach efforts.

Biotechnology
Ensure that descriptions of MOA, gene sequence, product concepts, etc. are consistent with any prior Biotechnology communications or publications on MON # or related biotech traits. Ensure that the manuscript is consistent with the Regulatory and Biotechnology publication strategy.

Patent Scientist
Determine that all relevant patents related to MON # are fully in place. Ensure publication does not impact right of Monsanto to make, use, or sell the claimed invention or MON #. Ensure there are no statements or assessments that could result in a loss of IP.

Patent Attorney
Determine if any patents related to MON # are fully in place. Ensure publication does not impact right of Monsanto to make, use, or sell the claimed invention or MON # or a limited period of time. Ensure there are no statements or assessments that could result in a loss of IP. Confirm assessment of patent scientists.

Regulatory Regional Lead
Ensure that the manuscript is consistent with the regional Regulatory strategy. Ensure that individuals that have contributed substantial, direct, intellectual work to this manuscript are included as authors and other significant contributions are appropriately acknowledged.

Responsibility	Program Lead, TC	TC Lead	Regulatory TL	Crop/Chem TL	Regulatory Law	Scientific Affairs	Biotech-nology	Patent Scientist	Patent Attorney	Regional Lead
Scientific conclusions are clearly stated and supported by the data	x	x								
Determine whether publication is first TC publication on this event and follows past TC publication practices	x									
Forward MCF to other TC representatives for review		x								
Description of MOA, product concept, etc. is consistent with PCT and Biotech standards			x	X		x	x			
Manuscript fits with crop team's overall strategic positioning and publication strategy			x	x		x	x			x
Confirm no comparative assessments or statements between different MONs and that reference to other MONs is accurate and consistent with prior communications				x						
Ensure that any policy statements or implications are consistent with Regulatory and scientific outreach strategies						x				x
Ensure that publication of MON # (or other invention) is legal and does not compromise Monsanto FTO or intellectual property					x			x	x	
Verify authorship and acknowledgements	x	x								x

EXHIBIT E

Message

From: Buelig, Mattias [redacted]

Sent: 7/19/2012 10:18:12 AM

To: [redacted] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=EA-5041-01/cn=Recipients/cn=83930]; Pepita Duran [redacted] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=EA-5041-01/cn=Recipients/cn=107838]; [redacted]@arystalifescience.com; 'Annette Salomonsen' [redacted]@dow.com; [redacted]@at.nufarm.com; [redacted]@syngenta.com; [redacted]@afrasa.es; [redacted]@agria.bg; 'Bob Nicholls' [redacted]@agrotrade.de; [redacted]@etracoms.com; [redacted]@agrichem.nl; [redacted]@barclay.ie; 'Slawomir Kijowski' [redacted]; [redacted]@excelcropcare.com; [redacted]@helmag.com; [redacted]@pinus-tki.si; [redacted]@rotam.com; 'Shalaka Shelar' [redacted]@sfp-rd.com; [redacted]@uk.exponent.com; [redacted]@agro.sapec.pt; [redacted]@uniphos.com; [redacted]@wynca.com

CC: 'Martyn Hargraves' [redacted] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=EA-5040-01/cn=Recipients/cn=233911]; HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=230737]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=DASALT]; [redacted] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=EA-5041-01/cn=Recipients/cn=107838]

Subject: AW: Genotox Review: your approval requested!

Dear [redacted]

FCS agrees to the additional costs as well.

Best regards,

Mattias

Von: [redacted]
Gesendet: Mittwoch, 18. Juli 2012 19:12
An: [redacted]; Pepita Duran; [redacted]; [redacted]@arystalifescience.com; 'Annette Salomonsen'; [redacted]@dow.com; Buelig, Mattias; [redacted]@at.nufarm.com; [redacted]@syngenta.com; [redacted]@afrasa.es; [redacted]@agria.bg; 'Bob Nicholls'; [redacted]@agrotrade.de; [redacted]@etracoms.com; [redacted]@agrichem.nl; [redacted]@barclay.ie; 'Sławomir Kijowski'; [redacted]@excelcropcare.com; [redacted]@helmag.com; [redacted]@pinus-tki.si; [redacted]@rotam.com; 'Shalaka Shelar'; [redacted]@sfp-rd.com; [redacted]@uk.exponent.com; [redacted]@agro.sapec.pt; [redacted]@uniphos.com; [redacted]@wynca.com
Cc: 'Martyn Hargraves'; [redacted]; HEYDENS, WILLIAM F (AG/1000); SALTMIRAS, DAVID A (AG/1000); [redacted]
Betreff: Genotox Review: your approval requested!
Wichtigkeit: Hoch

URGENT REQUEST

Dear [redacted]

As part of the GTF literature review the RWG and Board agreed to ask Larry Kier (former Monsanto expert and now independent consultant) to write a genetox review paper on technical glyphosate and glyphosate based Plant Protection Products. This paper would pool data from confidential Taskforce Member studies which was the reason why David Saltmiras (MON), chair to the tox-TWG, stepped down as a co-author for this paper. In addition when trying to combine both reviews (on technical glyphosate and PPPs) the manuscript turned into such a large mess of studies reporting genetoxic effects, that the story as written stretched the limits of credibility among less sophisticated audiences. For most 'stories', the approach would have been fine. But even though we feel confident that glyphosate is not genotoxic, this became a very difficult story to tell given all the complicated 'noise' out there. So David Saltmiras, Larry Kier and Bill Heydens consulted by other Monsanto tox experts thought there was a need to re-group & redesign the approach to the manuscript.

The suggested approach was to split-up the reviews in 2 papers (one on tech glyphosate and one on PPPs). In addition it was suggested that one way to help enhance credibility is to have an additional author on the papers who is a renowned specialist in the area of genotoxicity. Larry Kier did a search for possible co-authors and came up with 5. After internal discussion and some checking by David Saltmiras with fellow TWG tox folks (see extracts from TWG-meeting minutes below), Dr. David Kirkland was identified as the best candidate.

David Kirkland is an independent consultant with a history at Covance Laboratories. He is an expert in 'COMET'-assays on PPPs and is member of the editorial board for 'Mutagen Research' and member of the Environmental Mutagen Society in the UK. David Kirkland would most definitely add substantial expertise and credibility to this critical paper.

The initial cost estimate for this manuscript was 9k$ (approved by the board).

Adding David Kirkland as a co-author to both review papers would add £14,000 (pounds Stirling) to the project, which split by 25 seems a fair investment.

Please let me know as soon as possible if we have your support to proceed with David Kirkland as a co-author. We need a decision soon since David Kirkland only has the month of August to work on the papers.

David, [redacted] please let me know if I missed or misinterpreted something.

Best regards,

[redacted]

From: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 4:54 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Genotox Review

[redacted]

Below are extracts from recent meeting minutes this month. David Kirkland was discussed as a strong candidate to coauthor on July 2nd and ToxTWG endorsed him on July 16th and plans to engage him were put in motion.

- From July 2nd

a. Genotoxicity review manuscript.

i. Discussed approaches for literature and data reviews

ii. Consensus gained for two companion papers on active ingredient and formulated product genotoxicity data (GTF member company data and peer reviewed publications

iii. **Co-authors with Larry Kier were discussed. David Kirkland was proposed as strong candidate for this role.** Syngenta proposed Barry Elliott, expressing possible bias towards COMET assay data by David Kirkland. Simon will inquire within the Syngenta genotox group on suitability of David Kirkland to provide an objective scientific review including weight of evidence for the full data set (GTF member study reports and peer reviewed publications).

- NOTE: Larry had contacted David Kirkland yesterday to discuss the paper and Larry contacted David Saltmiras today (Tuesday July 3rd) to debrief.

- Larry is convinced that David Kirkland will provide a strong technical skill set to evaluate the breadth of data including the COMET data (weighing convenience of

COMET assays with credible data interpretability) and believes David Kirkland would be an excellent choice to co-author the manuscript.

- David Kirkland is available to work on this project in August/Sept and submit to the journal by the end of September.

iv. Still targeting *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, based on the length of these papers.

- Larry has briefly discussed with the chief editor of *Critical Reviews in Toxicology* (Roger McClellen), who expressed concern that the GTF member study reports are not public (weighing in on negative genotox results) vs the publication record (weighing in on positive genotox results). This will present itself as an issue with any credible journal. To have credibility, rather than make all study reports public, the GTF may consider submitting all the genotoxicity study Tier II Summaries from the dossier (which may well fall into the public domain) as supplementary data to the journal.

- **Please email David Saltmiras regarding this approach of submitting the TIIS for genotox studies as supplementary data if your company owns genotoxicity data.**

- **From July 16th**

2. Genotoxicity review manuscript

a. David Saltmiras will circulate contact information for David Kirkland for individual companies to arrange CDAs (Arysta LifeScience, Cheminova, Excel Crop Care, Feinchemie Schwebda, Helm, Nufarm, Syngenta).

b. Data for manuscript

i. General agreement was reached to provide member company study methodology and data summaries as supplementary information in support of publications on (i) active substance and (ii) formulated products.

ii. Study summaries and citations should be sanitized to exclude

- Study director names

- Data owner/company name

iii. Study summaries and citations may include

- Study/report number
- Study/report title
- Year of study/report
- Performing laboratory (not necessary, sometimes deleted/sanitized for public information like DARs)
- Test substance purity (for active substance)
- Formulation type (for formulated product)
- Note of whether GLP or non-GLP
- Test Guideline(s) followed (OECD/US EPA, JMAFF, etc.)
- Brief description of methodology
- Summarized data tables

iv. Transfer of study information between coauthors

- Larry Kier needs to email a rider/CDA amendment for each company to grant him permission to share data with David Kirkland.
- Larry Kier and David Kirkland should sign a CDA with eachother.

David Saltmiras, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.
Toxicology Manager
Regulatory Product Safety Center
Monsanto
ph [redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 9:40 AM
To: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]

Cc: [redacted]; HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Genotox Review

Will do!!

From: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 3:47 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]; HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Subject: FW: Genotox Review
Importance: High

[redacted]

Will you please take this to the RWG ASAP? At this point we have an open Monsanto contract with David Kirkland, CDA's with individual member companies are being initiated and Larry Kier plans to get a draft manuscript to him by the end of the month (i.e. in less than 2 weeks). Kirkland is only available to work in this project in August and approval of his involvement is strongly recommended by the ToxTWG. If our time lines slip on this we will probably not have a genotoxicity review manuscript available for our submission window in January.

Is there a way to get this through the RWG in a week?

Thanks,

David Saltmiras, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.
Toxicology Manager
Regulatory Product Safety Center
Monsanto
ph [redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 8:24 AM

To: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; [redacted]
[redacted]
Cc: LEMKE, SHAWNA LIN [AG/1000]; KRONENBERG, JOEL M [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Genotox Review

I think it has to go through the normal process- TWG to RWG to Board, with documented agreement at each stage. Once the RWG has agreed we can do the Board by email.

I think Bill H's summary could be a good basis for getting RWG alignment.

[redacted]

From: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 5:54 PM
To: [redacted]]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; [redacted]
[redacted]
Cc: LEMKE, SHAWNA LIN [AG/1000]; KRONENBERG, JOEL M [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Genotox Review

[redacted]

David & I were just touching base on a couple things, and we were wondering what your thinking is on how to progress this with the Board – let us know – thanks.

Bill

From: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 1:09 PM
To: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; [redacted]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; [redacted]
[redacted]; [redacted]
Cc: LEMKE, SHAWNA LIN [AG/1000]; KRONENBERG, JOEL M [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Genotox Review

[redacted]

Here is my further perspective on top of David's…

As David notes, we are still essentially talking about lines 12 & 13 on the Excel spreadsheet you sent. David embarked on the Genetox publication work with Larry Kier as agreed by the Board.

But here is what transpired after that. After they got all the studies amassed into a draft manuscript, it unfortunately turned into such a large mess of studies reporting genetoxic effects, that the story as written stretched the limits of credibility among less sophisticated audiences. For most 'stories', the approach would have been fine. But even though we feel confident that glyphosate is not genotoxic, this became a very difficult story to tell given all the complicated 'noise' out there. So we (David, Larry, Bill H, Joel & Shawna) thought we needed to re-group & redesign the approach to the manuscript. As part of that re-tooling approach, it was suggested that one way to help enhance credibility is to have an additional author on the paper who is a heavy-hitter in the area of genotoxicity. Larry did a search for possible co-authors and came up with 5. After internal discussion and some checking by David with fellow TWG tox folks, we landed on Kirkland as the best candidate. That has led to the request you have before you.

So if you think there needs to be a discussion with the Board rather than trying to gain approval via e-mail, then we could take that approach, but this obviously slows down the process. Is there a Board phone conference scheduled anytime soon?

Bill

From: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 11:20 AM
To: [redacted]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; [redacted]; [redacted]
Subject: RE: Genotox Review

[redacted], I have to run to a meeting, but I will give you my perspective later today when you are drinking G&Ts.

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 11:17 AM
To: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; [redacted] HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; [redacted]
Subject: RE: Genotox Review

There is a lot of information here which the Board has not seen (to my knowledge) . The discussion of published summaries took place at the 13th Meeting (March 2012) and I attach the information which was presented and agreed (according to the Minutes). I think you will agree that the current situation needs to go to the Board for a second discussion and updated Agreement.

If [redacted] or Bill H have any additional information about the Board discussions on this subject then I will gladly change my opinion.

[redacted]

From: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 3:48 PM
To: [redacted]; HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; [redacted]
Subject: RE: Genotox Review

[redacted]

Two different projects have been merged, the first of which was well underway before the PAG was instituted. The initial project was a review manuscript of the glyphosate genotoxicity literature authored by Larry Kier and me (authorized Feb 22, 2011 for $9,000). The second (initiated by the PAG and supported by the RWG and Board, cost estimate of $13,195) was a review manuscript involving all glyphosate genotoxicity studies owned by GTF member companies on both active ingredient and formulated products, authored by Larry; the review of GTF members' proprietary study reports prohibit my coauthorhip.

This first became a very long and tedious manuscript, which would have been difficult to publish. Following on from this first draft manuscript review, discussions with Bill H., Joel, [redacted] and Larry Kier resulted in a merging of the two projects (also discussed at the ToxTWG) with a view to publish two companion manuscripts on glyphosate genotoxicity for the active ingredient (paper 1) and formulated products (paper 2). Thus Larry was

the sole author and given his geography and industry alignment, other highly credible genotoxicologists coauthors from European were sought. David Kirkland was the first choice of the GTF ToxTWG.

David Kirkland's expertise comes at a premium. I believe Larry Kier significantly under charges for his services, but his combined cost estimate for project 1 and project 2 is $22,195. David Kirkland believes his efforts will be less than 10 days at £1,400/day (equivalent to $21,780 with the current exchange rate), so we are effectively doubling the cost of the combined projects, but reaping significant value/credibility from David Kirkland's involvement. Given the growing number of questionable genotoxicity publications, in my mind this is worth the addition cost.

I have subsequently coordinated an open master contract between Monsanto and David Kirkland (we may need his services in the future) and on the next ToxTWG call (Monday) will request all member companies get confidentiality agreements in place with him ASAP (the same CDAs as previously signed with Larry Kier, enabling him to see their study reports).

David Saltmiras, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.
Toxicology Manager
Regulatory Product Safety Center
Monsanto
ph [redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 9:01 AM
To: [redacted]; HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; [redacted]
Subject: Genotox Review

The project was initiated by the PAG and supported by the RWG and Board. The cost was $9k and I thought the job had been completed. The name "David Kirkland" has never come to my attention before and I would suggest that the RWG needs to explain to the Board why , at this point, it believes that trebling the expenditure to include a second author is a justifiable expense.

I wonder if this is a true PAG project where those companies who want to see this work carried out pay for it.

I have received questions about future expenditure and I cannot see it on [redacted] list which went to the Board for approval/discussion last month.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 2:04 PM
To: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]
Cc: [redacted]; [redacted]
Subject: RE: A FedEx shipment [redacted] was created.

[redacted]

The proposal sounds very reasonable and having David Kirkland co-authoring this paper can only strengthen the case. Since the board has approved the project I agree it makes sense to ask the board directly to approve the extra funding. It I don't seem to remember this (adding Kirkland) being discussed at RWG level but could be wrong. If not I'll send out an update message to make sure everyone is on the same page.

Regards,

[redacted]

From: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 10:52 PM
To: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]; [redacted]
Subject: RE: A FedEx shipment [redacted] was created.

[redacted]

We (David, Joel, Kier, me) think we should proceed with pursuing Kirkland as a co-author for the glyphosate genetox publication. David also got some other toxicologist feedback from within the Tox TWG and that was favorable as well.

So how should we proceed? For expediency, since this project is already supported by the Board, could we have [redacted] go directly to the Board by sending out a note asking them to approve contracting with Kirkland for an estimated maximum amount of £14,000?

Thanks.

Bill

From: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 11:03 AM
To: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; [redacted]
Subject: FW: A FedEx shipment [redacted] was created.

[redacted]

We (Monsanto) have a signed master contract with David Kirkland. This will enable him to coauthor the genotoxicity review paper with Larry Kier, as well as engaging him on any other projects which may come up…. it may be necessary to have an EU based expert in genotoxicity on hand if issues arise during the regulatory review.

Please note David's estimated cost, below, which will need GTF board approval….he thinks likely less than 10 days work (at £1,400/day).

David Saltmiras, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.
Toxicology Manager
Regulatory Product Safety Center

Monsanto
ph [redacted]

From: David Kirkland [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 10:49 AM
To: SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: A FedEx shipment [redacted] was created.

David,

Daily rate is equivalent to 8 hours, namely GBP1400 per day.

I estimate a maximum of 10 days (i.e. GBP14,000) but unless I have to delve very deeply into a lot of the reports and papers that Larry includes, it should be less than this.

Kind regards,

David.

States, potentially
including but not limited to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) and sanctions regulations issued by the U.S. Department of
Treasury, Office of Foreign Asset Controls (OFAC). As a recipient of this information you are obligated to comply with all
applicable U.S. export laws and regulations.

[redacted]

EXHIBIT F

Proposal for Post-IARC Meeting Scientific Projects

DRAFT

May 11, 2015

Why do more?

- Severe stigma attached to Group 2A Classification
- Aaron Blair continues to defend work & exaggerate number of studies w/ association while ignoring AHS
- In response to our critique, can expect IARC to beef-up monograph as much as possible
- IARC plans to pool data globally in the future
  - Blair announced at meeting that he has already put together an unofficial work group to begin the process
  - North American Pooled Project (NAPP) already underway and early results reported in 2014
  - Believe this will be used to move pesticides to Group 1
- Provide additional support ('air cover') for future regulatory reviews
  - Broad EU review recently recommended by BfR
  - Other regulatory agencies stated they will review after Monograph publishes
- ASTDR evaluation
- Prop 65
- Litigation support

Counter IARC's selective use of data and flawed analyses/conclusions on Epidmiology, Animal Bioassays, and Genotoxicity (Mode of Action); Prevent future adverse outcomes

Possibilities:

- Conduct and Publish new Meta-analysis
- Publication on Animal Data Cited by IARC* *New*
- Publish updated AHS study data
- Publish WoE/Plausibility Paper
- Genetox/MOA

New Meta-analysis

- **Project Description**
  - Conduct proper meta-analysis to support the position that glyphosate is NOT associated with NHL and multiple myeloma
  - Publish separately & can be used in overall WOE/Plausibility publication (below)
  - Could be completed/published prior to IARC Monograph
- **Risk**
  - None, since we have already done the analysis
- **Cost**
  - $32K plus any translation costs

[Timing – Donna checking w/ Exponent, but currently estimate 3-4 months to write plus 2+ months to get online publication]

Publication on Animal Carcinogenicity Data

- **Project Description**
  - Publication on Animal Data Noted by IARC as Evidence for Carcinogenicity
  - Studies/Tumors Involved:
    - Mouse kidney tumors – subject of claims that Monsanto convinced EPA to change conclusions
    - Haemangiosarcoma in mice (Cheminova), pancreatic islet cell tumors in 2 rat studies (Monsanto) – multiple regulatory reviews conducted, including WHO/FAO
    - Publication on Initiation-promotion study with Roundup®
  - Greim & 1or 2 other external authors?
  - Could be completed/published prior to IARC Monograph
  - Could we add Japan data (TAC, Mitsui (formerly Sankyo)? Would likely increase timeline
- **Cost**
  - Majority of writing can be done by Monsanto, keeping OS$ down

AHS Collaboration

- **Project Description**
  - Submit proposal to AHS to collaborate on project to add last several 10 years of data & publish
  - Do with expert academicians – (e.g., Tom Sorahan, Tim Lash, David Coggin)
- **Risk – low**
  - We already know data is 'negative' through 2008/2009 (Freeman *et al*, 2009)
  - AHS certainly would have already published any "+"
  - Write stringent protocol ahead of time
  - 'Seasoned' rational experts would be doing the analysis not just post-docs from AHS who need to 'make a mark'
- **Downside**
  - Longer term project – won't get quick results
  - AHS Executive Committee may decline
    - Plan B -> FOI Request
- **Cost**
  - Total ~$75K; initial cost to make proposal substantially less

Overall WOE/Plausibility Publication Possibly via Expert Panel Concept

- **Project Description**
  - Publish comprehensive evaluation of carcinogenic potential by credible scientists
- **Possible Panelists/Authors**
  - Solomon? (Exposure), Sorahan (Epidemiology), Greim? (Animal bioassay), G. Williams, Kirkland? (Genetox/MOA), Sir Colin Barry, Jerry Rice (ex-IARC head)
- **Cost**
  - $200 – 250 K, depending on:
    - Who/how many scientists we include
    - How much writing can be done by Monsanto scientists to help keep costs down
  - Alternative: 1 or 2 separate publications w/ subset of authors?

Genetox / MOA

- Counter IARC's claim of strong evidence of DNA damage/oxidative stress
- Could be important for future litigation support
- Gary Williams (NY Medical College) - Use gene expression to firm-up non-genotoxic MOA in positive *in vitro* studies with formulations
- Contact Rich Irons?

Feedback

Conduct and Publish new Meta-analysis

- ***Legal*** – value not apparent
- ***RPSA*** – 'No-Brainer'
- ***CE*** – Makes sense; have pre-release and/or present at scientific meeting before publication; RPSA needs to work on explaining to public
- ***Brussels RA*** – clear value; get out before IARC Monograph

Publish updated AHS study data

- ***Legal*** – most appealing; MON somewhat distanced & AHS involved
- ***RPSA*** – 'No Brainer'; add 2,4-D & dicamba?
- ***CE*** – Makes sense; have pre-release and/or present at scientific meeting before publication; RPSA needs to work on explaining to public
- ***Brussels RA*** – clear value; agree w/ RPSA; get out before IARCMonograph if possible (not likely)

Feedback

Publish WoE/Plausibility Paper

- ***Legal*** – Appealing; best if use big names; better if sponsored by some group
- ***RPSA*** – How helpful to regulators? Could we do totally independent?
- ***CE*** - If done, real value in having 3rd party manage process; add a couple MDs; work with Shawna to have a couple key stakeholders (e.g., GMA) watch/hear the proceedings & take back to their communities
- ***Brussels RA*** – less clear benefit; will it really 'trump' IARC in needed circles?

Genetox/MOA

- ***Legal*** – cannot assess value
- ***RPSA*** – Need to address this; include household surfactants
- ***CE*** – no real comment
- ***Brussels RA*** – agree with RPSA; also finish Nik Hodges study

Additional Suggestions from CE

- Get someone like Jerry Rice (ex-IARC) to publish paper on IARC
  - How it was formed, how it works, hasn't evolved over time, they are archaic and not needed now
- Exposure paper that shows how exposure is really, really low!
- Form Crop Protection Advisory Group?
  - Includes nutritionist, MDs along with traditional science groups; include a NGO?
  - Internal contacts = Mike Parish/ Matt Helms, Kelly Fleming, Cvance Crow, Janice Persons
- Communication Plans
  - Need to build in right plans for all steps/actions, including plan that works for millenials; start as early as possible

EXHIBIT G

Message

From: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000] [/o=Monsanto/ou=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=230737]
on behalf of HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Sent: 1/6/2016 10:46:07 PM
To: 'Ashley Roberts Intertek' [redacted]
Subject: RE: Glyphosate Expert Panel Manuscripts

Great – I will call you tomorrow AM – thanks!

From: Ashley Roberts Intertek [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2016 4:22 PM
To: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Glyphosate Expert Panel Manuscripts

Hi Bill,

I am free tomorrow morning so give me a call anytime.

I am just going through the summary so hope to have this to you by COB on Friday. We can discuss the other aspects/questions tomorrow.

Best Wishes

Ashley

Ashley Roberts, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President
Food & Nutrition Group
Intertek Scientific & Regulatory Consultancy
[redacted]

[redacted]

From: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000] [redacted]@[redacted]
Sent: January-06-16 5:08 PM
To: Ashley Roberts Intertek
Subject: Glyphosate Expert Panel Manuscripts

Hi Ashley,

Thanks for the updates on the Animal Bioassay and Summary chapters – I am not surprised at the challenges with the Summary chapter!

I wanted to update you on what I/we have been doing on our end.

Back in mid-December, I forwarded the final Epidemiology & Genotoxicity manuscripts from John & Larry to our resident expert report/manuscript preparation person here at Monsanto to put them in the format (including references) specified by *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*. The re-formatting was done and a number of questions came up (mostly on references), which I have sent back to Larry & John to resolve (John says he will be done tomorrow – no surprise).

During re-formatting of Epi & Genetox sections, the question came up about needing an Abstract for each chapter (currently none have Abstracts written). That makes sense for a single stand-alone publication, but I don't know if *CRT* will require an Abstract for each chapter when they publish a multi-chapter stand-alone Supplement? Or could we get by with 1 overall Abstract that goes with either the Introduction chapter or the Summary chapter? Do you have thoughts on that? Should we ask Roger McClellan?

I had already written a draft Introduction chapter back in October/November, but I want to go back and re-read it to see if it could benefit from any 're-freshing' based on things that have transpired over the last 10-12 weeks. I will do that in the next few days. Then I was thinking I would run it by you for your comments/edits. And then comes the question of who should be the ultimate author – you or Gary? I was thinking you for the Introduction chapter and Gary for the Summary chapter, but I am totally open to your suggestions.

That leaves the Exposure chapter from Keith – I am not totally sure where that stands – I vaguely recall that he was still going to make a few changes? I think you and I should talk about how that chapter gets completed, as it is not exactly what I was expecting. Do you have any time Thursday AM? I have a meeting 7:30-8:00 AM and 9:00-10:00 my time, but I could call you before/between/after those meetings. Alternatively, bright & early Friday morning? Let me know what works.

Thanks much,

Bill

EXHIBIT H

Message

From: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=230737]
Sent: 2/9/2016 11:43:08 PM
To: Ashley Roberts Intertek [redacted]
Subject: RE: summary article
Attachments: Summary Manuscript Draft 2 0 Feb 5 2016_jfa_wfh.docx

Ashley,

OK, I have gone through the entire document and indicated what I think should stay, what can go, and in a couple spots I did a little editing. I took a crack at adding a little text on page 10 to address John's comments about toxicologists' use of Hill's criteria – see what you think; it made sense to me, but I'm not sure if it will to others - please feel free to further modify and/or run by Gary.

After you have looked through this, let's discuss.

Thanks,

Bill

From: Ashley Roberts Intertek [redacted]
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 3:15 PM
To: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Subject: FW: summary article

Hi Bill,

Please take a look at the latest from the epi group!!!!

Can you call me once you have digested this.

Thanks

Ashley

Ashley Roberts, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President
Food & Nutrition Group
Intertek Scientific & Regulatory Consultancy
[redacted]

From: John Acquavella [redacted]
Sent: February-08-16 4:00 PM
To: Ashley Roberts Intertek
Subject: summary article

Ashley:

Let me start by saying that I share your goal of having complete expert panel authorship on the summary article. I've had some initial correspondence from the panelists about the summary article and the consensus is that they will not be authors on an article that has inflammatory comments about IARC. Assuming those inflammatory comments were carried over from the animal carcinogenicity and genotoxicity articles, I'm sure the epi panelists would not want to be associated with those articles either.

To achieve the complete authorship goal, an extensive revision of the summary article is necessary. To facilitate, I've edited the entire summary article to take out most of the inflammatory statements about IARC. The view of the epi panelists is that the inflammatory comments are not necessary and will cause readers to disregard the outstanding scientific work that was done by the panels. Inflammatory statements will certainly

cause IARC and IARC's vocal supporters to push back hard to defend their evaluation and discredit Monsanto's expert panel process and panelists. I think you have seen the recent article in which many well known epidemiologists banded together to defend IARC (see Pearce et al. 2005 attached). Our strongest point is the quality of our scientific reviews, not disparaging the IARC process or the work of monograph 112 workgroups. To the extent that there are inflammatory comments about IARC in the articles by the other panels, I suggest you work with the authors to remove them.

In addition, I noted the following in my review of the summary article:

- Hill's criteria are misapplied by the toxicology panels. Please review applications of Hill's criteria with Doug Weed who is an expert on the intended meaning of each criterion. It will detract from the toxicology arguments to misuse these criteria. I suggest you also ask Doug to look at the animal carcinogenicity and genotoxicity articles to make sure that Hill's criteria are cited appropriately.
- With respect to exposure, I think the margin of safety is underestimated in various sections of the article because the RfD is a daily dose and the applicator exposures are very infrequent. I addressed this in an article in Annals of Epidemiology in 2003 that was the work of an ECPA taskforce. See reference below and article attached.

I expect to have specific suggestions from the epi panelists later this week. I will compile the unique suggestions and send them on to you asap.

Regards,

John

Acquavella JF, Doe J, Tomenson J, Chester G, Cowell J, Bloemen L. Epidemiologic Studies of Occupational Pesticide Exposure and Cancer: Regulatory Risk Assessments and Biologic Plausibility. Annals of Epidemiology 2003; 13: 1-7.

Glyphosate: Carcinogenic potential – the conclusions of IARC (2015) – A Critical review by an Expert Panel

Authors: Gary Williams[a*], Tom Sorahan[b], Marilyn Aardema[c], John Acquavella[d], Sir Colin Berry[e], David Brusick[f], Michele Burns[g], Joao Lauro Viana de Camargo[h], David Garabrant[i], Helmut Greim[j], Larry Kier[k], David Kirkland[l], Gary Marsh[m], Keith Solomon[n], Douglas Weed[o], Ashley Roberts[p]

[a]Professor of Pathology, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY

[b]Professor of Occupational Epidemiology, University of Birmingham, UK

[c]Consulting, LLC,. Fairfield, OH, USA

[d]Professor, Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University, Denmark

[e]Emeritus Professor or Pathology

[f]Toxicology Consultant, Bumpass, VA, USA

[g]Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, MA

[h]Department of Pathology, São Paulo State University, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

[i]EpidStat Institute; Emeritus Professor of Occupational Medicine and Epidemiology, University of Michigan

[j]Technical University Munich, Germany

[k]Private Consultant, Buena Vista, CO USA

[l]Kirkland Consulting, Tadcaster, UK

[m]Professor of Biostatistics, Founder and Director, Center for Occupational Biostatistics & Epidemiology, University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public Health

[n] Centre for Toxicology, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON Canada

[o]DLW Consulting Services, LLC; Adjunct Professor, University of New Mexico School of Medicine

[p]Intertek Regulatory & Scientific Consultancy, Mississauga, Ontario CANADA

Keywords: Glyphosate, aminomethylphosphoric acid, Roundup, herbicide, cancer, genotoxicity

*Corresponding Author Contact info

Table of contents

[TOC \o "1-3" \h \z \u]

[PAGE * MERGEFORMAT]

Abstract

Introduction

Glyphosate, or N-(phosphonomethyl)glycine (CAS# 1071-83-6), is a widely used broad-spectrum, non-selective post-emergent herbicide. It effectively suppresses the growth of many species of trees, grasses, and weeds. Glyphosate works by interfering with the synthesis of the aromatic amino acids phenylalanine, tyrosine, and tryptophan, through the inhibition of the enzyme 5-enolpyruvylshikimate-3-phosphate synthase (EPSPS). Inhibition of the synthesis of these amino acids stops rapidly growing plants such as weeds. Importantly, EPSPS is not present in mammalian species. Glyphosate is extensively used in agriculture, especially in the post-emergent control of weeds in fields of corn, cereals, soybean, oilseed, and sugar beet. To further enhance the effectiveness of glyphosate in agriculture, a number of genetically modified crop varieties have been developed which are tolerant to glyphosate (i.e. allows for application after emergence of the crops). In addition, given its effectiveness and broad-spectrum activity, glyphosate is also used worldwide for forestry, rights of way, landscape, and household control of weeds.

The safety, including the potential carcinogenicity, of glyphosate has been ~~extensively~~ reviewed by experienced scientists and ~~many~~ regulatory authorities worldwide, including the US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), the European Commission, and the Canadian Pest Management Regulatory Agency (Health and Welfare Canada 1991; US EPA 1993, 2013; WHO 1994; Williams et al. 2000; European Commission 2002; Kier & Kirkland 2013). The consensus ~~among these reviews~~ was that proper use of glyphosate and glyphosate-based formulations (GBFs) does not pose a genotoxic or carcinogenic hazard/risk to humans. As a result, glyphosate based herbicides have been approved for use in over 160 countries.

In 2015, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) published the Glyphosate Monograph of Volume 112 (IARC 2015). IARC (2015) categorized glyphosate as "*probably*

carcinogenic to humans" (Group 2A) based on ~~their conclusion that there is "~~*limited evidence*~~"~~ of carcinogenicity in human studies, citing a positive association with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, and ~~of "~~*sufficient evidence*" of carcinogenicity in experimental animals. In addition, IARC (2015) stated that there was strong evidence supporting that "glyphosate can operate through two key characteristics of known human carcinogens", genotoxicity and induction of oxidative stress. This mechanistic evidence conclusion was viewed as providing strong support for IARC classifying glyphosate as probably carcinogenic to humans, Group 2A.

Comment [wh1]: ASHLEY, I CAN LIVE WITH ANY OF THE DELETIONS BELOW ON THIS PAGE IF YOU ARE OK WITH THEM AS WELL

The classification of glyphosate as *probably carcinogenic to humans* differs from ~~is controversial as it is not consistent with~~ all previous and one subsequent glyphosate review ~~the views and opinions of~~ by scientific experts and regulatory bodies worldwide. ~~These regulatory bodies, including those outlined above and many others have reviewed all of the available scientific evidence, including the results of a plethora of epidemiology studies, numerous cancer bioassays in laboratory animal species, and an extensive array of genetic studies, including both data reported in the published literature as well as the results of the Good Laboratory Practices (GLP) and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/Redbook studies conducted by several companies as part of the normal series of studies conducted to support registration of an agricultural herbicide product.~~

~~Given that the IARC conclusion contradicts the conclusions reached by worldwide regulatory authorities, as well as of other independent scientists, and noting that the IARC classification ignores the important role exposure plays in a proper overall risk assessment~~ Accordingly, Intertek Scientific & Regulatory Consultancy Services (Mississauga, Ontario Canada) was commissioned by Monsanto Company to convened an Expert Panel ~~was convened~~ to assess independently the available data on glyphosate with respect to exposures, carcinogenicity studies conducted in experimental animals, genetic toxicity and mechanistic data, and epidemiological studies. ~~These broad areas of research were evaluated in relation to the~~

opinions reached by IARC (2015). The Expert Panel was composed of individuals with documented expertise in the four broad areas, of interest with respect to the carcinogenic potential of glyphosate. Presented herein are the results of the deliberations of the Expert Panel and a summary of their conclusions. For each of the four areas of interest (exposure, animal cancer bioassays, genetic toxicity, and epidemiology) the data evaluated, and the method of evaluation, and the conclusions of the experts are summarized outlined in the sections below.

Exposures to glyphosate

Unpublished reports of studies on exposure to glyphosate in applicators were provided by Monsanto Company which covered uses in agriculture and forestry. Other data on exposures were obtained from the open literature as a result of searches in PubMed®, references in reviews, and Google Scholar®. These papers and reports were grouped into sources of exposures and the data analyzed as described below.

Only one paper reported concentrations of glyphosate in air. In a study conducted in Iowa, Mississippi, and Indiana in 2007 and 2008, concentrations of glyphosate and its major environmental degradate, aminomethylphosphonic acid (AMPA), were measured in air and precipitation (Chang et al. 2011). For estimation of human exposure, it was assumed that there was 100% total absorption of glyphosate from the air into the body of a 70 kg human breathing 8 m^3 air (half a day for an adult) (US EPA 2009). Also, surface water measurements of glyphosate as part of the National Water-Quality Assessment (NAWQA) program (USGS 2015) since 2002 were downloaded from the NAWQA data warehouse and then sorted by concentration. All values measured across the US between 2002 and 2014 were pooled for the analysis. Where concentrations were less than the level of detection (0.02 µg glyphosate acid equivalents (a.e.)/L), these values were substituted with a dummy value of "zero". Although

chlorine and ozone are highly effective for removing glyphosate and AMPA during purification of drinking water (Jönsson et al. 2013), it was assumed that treatment did not remove any glyphosate. The estimated concentrations are thus a worst-case.

Studies documenting exposures through food and to "bystanders" were reviewed and data extracted (Curwin et al. 2007; Acquavella et al. 2004; Mesnage et al. 2012; Hoppe et al. 2013; Honeycutt and Rowlands (2014); Niemann et al. 2015). For those, publications that provided actual systemic dose calculations, these values were used, rather than estimates calculated from default exposure factors (e.g. body weight, water consumption, breathing rate, etc.). Where the systemic dose was calculated, it was used. Where dietary exposures were calculated the urinary concentration was used to calculate the systemic dose on the assumption of 2 L of urine per day and a 60 kg person (Niemann et al. 2015). In 2013, the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) reviewed dietary exposures to glyphosate (glyphosate, N-acetyl glyphosate, AMPA and N-acetyl AMPA) and calculated the international estimated daily intakes (IEDI) of glyphosate for 13 regional food diets (JMPR 2014). These IEDIs were based on estimated mean residues from supervised trials under normal or good agricultural practice. The US EPA has calculated exposures to glyphosate using the Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model (DEEM, ver 7.81), based on tolerance levels for all commodities and modeled estimates of exposures from food and drinking water for the overall US population (US EPA 2012).

A relatively large number of studies on exposures of applicators to glyphosate have been conducted (121 dosimetry studies and 128 biomonitoring studies). For studies using dosimetry, the normalization to systemic dose was conducted using the following assumptions: 70 kg adult, 2.1 m^2 surface area for a 70 kg male (US EPA 2009), 10% penetration through clothing if not actually measured, 3% dermal penetration. The estimated systemic doses were ranked from smallest to largest and a cumulative frequency distribution derived. These values were

plotted on a log-probability scale. The median (50th centile) and 90th centile values were calculated from the raw data using the Excel function <=percentile>.

Where an applicator makes a single application, the systemic dose of glyphosate can be estimated from the total amount of glyphosate excreted in the urine over the four or five days following and including the day of application (Acquavella et al. 2004). If applications are conducted every day, the amount excreted each day provides a time-weighted average for daily exposures. Because glyphosate is applied infrequently in normal agricultural practice, the assumption of a single initial exposure is considered appropriate for risk assessment purposes.

Air Exposures

Based on the above assumptions, inhaling glyphosate in air at the maximum measured concentration would result in an exposure of 1.04 x 10^{-6} mg/kg body mass (b.m.)/d. This is about six orders of magnitude less than the current US EPA's reference dose (RfD) of 1.75 mg/kg b.m./d, which is the US EPA's allowable limit for consumption of residues of glyphosate exposure based on toxicity studies.

Comment [JA2]: I believe this is the amount allowed daily. Seems worth mentioning as the potential for airborne exposure happens infrequently

Water Exposures

"The concentrations of glyphosate measured in US surface waters ranged from 0.02-73 µg/L. The 90th centile value was 0.79 µg/L, which corresponds to a systemic dose of 2.25 x 10^{-5} mg/kg/d, which is approximately five orders of magnitude below the US EPA's RfD.

Exposures from Food and bystanders

Estimates of glyphosate exposures to bystanders and the general public have been reported by various investigators (Curwin et al. 2007; Mesnage et al. 2012; Hoppe 2013; Honeycutt and Rowlands (2014); Krüger et al. 2014; Markard, 2014). In these studies, the range for estimates

of systemic doses was 0.000022-00063 mg/kg/d. All of these estimates are at least three orders of magnitude less than the US EPA's RfD.

Exposure within Applicators

The 50th and 90th centiles in the dosimetry studies were 0.0015 and 0.064 mg/kg/d, respectively. Neither of these values is particularly large when compared to the current US EPA's RfD of 1.75 mg/kg/d. The range of values for the systemic doses determined by biomonitoring was smaller than for the passive dosimeters and more accurately reflects the true exposures. The 50th and 90th centiles were 0.0003 and 0.0014 mg/kg/d, respectively. These are several orders of magnitude less than the US EPA's RfD.

In summary, there is a robust dataset on glyphosate exposures to humans. Even when using ~~various unrealistic~~worst-case assumptions, systemic exposures to applicators, bystanders and the general public are very small. Based on current RfDs and measured exposures, there is an extremely large margin of ~~safety no hazard~~ from exposure to glyphosate *via* normal uses.

Comment [wh3]: I M FINE WITH JOHN'S SUGGESTION

Comment [JA4]: Rather than say no hazard, perhaps say there is an extremely large margin of safety?

Cancer Bioassays

The recommended method for evaluating the results of an extensive database of toxicology and carcinogenicity bioassays, as exist for glyphosate, involves the application of a weight-of-evidence (WOE) approach. A methodology for using WOE approaches has been ~~identified and~~ developed by the US EPA (Suter & Cormier 2011) and although not universally approved, the approach has widespread acceptance. Such an approach requires that all reliable information ~~from whatever source~~ should be evaluated in making a judgement. ~~However, quality of the data/information must be scrutinized.~~ It therefore follows that in reviewing data on compounds that have been tested over many years; a careful examination of the precise nature of the studies reviewed must be made lest they fail to satisfy current standards of reliability. In any

Comment [JA5]: One would expect a reference regarding who recommended the WOE approach

review, if certain studies are judged to be unreliable and thus not included ~~to be ignored~~, the reasons for this should be provided. The Expert panel reviewed the incidences of the tumors in the various studies with respect to dose-response, rate of occurrence relative to known spontaneous rates in control animals, and on the basis of biological plausibility.

In the Monograph, IARC concluded that there is *sufficient evidence in experimental animals* for the carcinogenicity of glyphosate, based upon the following;

a) a positive trend in the incidence of a rare neoplasm, renal tubule carcinoma in male CD-1 mice ~~only~~;

b) a significant positive trend for the incidence of haemangiosarcoma in male mice in a different study;

c) in two studies, a significantly increased incidence of pancreatic islet-cell neoplasia in male SD rats, and,

d) a significant positive trend in the incidences of hepatocellular neoplasia in male SD rats and of thyroid C-cell neoplasia in female SD rats.

Comment [wh6]: I'M PROPOSEING THIS AS A COMPROMISE, AS I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH JOHN – THEY DID INTENTIONALLY IGNORE SOME STUDIES – THEY SAY SO IN THE MONOGRAPH

Comment [JA7]: The studies are not ignored. As mentioned, all are to be examined carefully. Perhaps you mean … if certain studies are considered to be unreliable for evaluative purposes …

Comment [JA8]: This seems a bit of a non-sequitur unless these are the reliability criteria the panel used. If so, state that explicitly.

Comment [wh9]: I WOULD IGNORE JOHN'S COMMENT

Comment [JA10]: Same strain as the previous finding?

Comment [JA11]: Later you say that IARC concluded that this data did not suggest a relationship to glyphosate. So, was this finding really important to their conclusion?

Comment [wh12]: YES IT WAS IMORTAT IN THEIR DECISION AND SHOULD BE INCLUDED

Kidney tubular-cell neoplasia in mice

In regards to the renal tubular tumors in male CD-1 mice, the Expert Panel noted that the conclusions of the IARC were based on only ~~two~~one 2-year oral mouse carcinogenicity stud~~ies~~y, (Monsanto 1983; Cheminova 1993a) excluding two additional 18-month oral studies in CD-1 mice (Arysta Life Sciences 1997; Nufarm 2009) and one 18-month oral study in Swiss Albino mice (Feinchemie Schwebda 2001). All of the studies were considered by authoritative bodies to have met the guidelines for a carcinogenicity bioassay in mice (ICH 1997; US EPA 1990).

Comment [wh13]: THE CHEMINOVA STUDY DID NOT HAVE ANY KIDNEY TUMOR ISSUE/QUESTION

In the ~~one~~ study referred to as Monsanto 1983 ~~considered by IARC (2015) to show evidence of renal tubular development associated with glyphosate treatment (Monsanto 1983)~~, the ~~overall final~~ incidence by dose of renal neoplasms in male mice was as follows: 1/49, 0/49, 1/50, and 3/50. The important non-neoplastic renal findings of hyperplasia, were as follows: 3/49, 0/49, 4/50, and 2/50, indicating lack of a dose-response, with the highest incidence in the mid-dose group, followed by the control group, and the high-dose (HD) group. The low-dose (LD) group had no renal findings. It is informative to apply ~~to the study by Monsanto (1983)~~ a modified form of the Hill viewpoints, which were originally presented as aspects that should be considered when assessing causation in Occupational Medicine, to parameters/endpoints assessed in standard animal bioassays; such an evaluation, while not the intention of Hill's presentation originally, can be performed in a similar manner to address~~covering~~ eight of the nine criteria of causation (Hill 1965; Woodside & Davis 2013) in order to determine whether an association between exposure and effect (two variables) might be deemed strong, consistent, specific, temporal, plausible, coherent, and to demonstrate a dose-response pattern. When applied to the study by Monsanto (1983), s~~S~~everal conclusions were drawn, including:

1. The association is not strong, since the higher incidences of rare renal neoplasms in dosed groups are not considered to be statistically different from the control group.

2. The association is not consistent, since four out of five mouse studies did not find ~~reproduce~~ similar renal neoplasms at comparable doses.

3. The association is not specific, since females of this pivotal study, which have been exposed to higher levels of glyphosate did not develop renal neoplasms. Also, there were no renal findings in the LD group, whereas the control group had two.

Comment [wh14]: I THINK YOU SHOULD KEEP IN THE SENTENCE BELOW THAT JOHN DELETED

Comment [wh15]: I AM SUGGESTING ADDING THIS WORDING TO MORE GENERICALLY ADDRESS SOME OF JOHN'S COMMENTS THAT THE TOXICOLOGISTS AREN'T GETTING THE HILL CRITERIA

Comment [JA16]: Specificity is not considered a viable Hill principle. Consider smoking that is not specific at all – heart disease, lung cancer, (protective Parkinson's disease), oral cancer, etc

Comment [wh17]: JOHN IS WRONG – IT IS THERE – IT IS THE 3 ONE MENTIONED BY HILL

Comment [JA18]: Strong in Hill's article refers to the size of the difference between exposure groups, not presence/absence of statistical significance.

Comment [JA19]: This is not what Hill meant by specificity. He meant that the exposure only caused 1 disease. Also, specificity has been refuted as a helpful criterion – witness that smoking causes many types of cancers and other diseases.

To me, this might be a matter of inconsistency unless males are particularly susceptible.

4. The time required between exposure and effect, i.e. a reduced latency time was not present; all tumors were observed only at termination.

5. The biological gradient of association or the dose-response curve was absent, since the females and the males in the LD group had no neoplasms, whereas there was one in the control group.

6. A plausible explanation for the association was absent, since the mode of action for induction of these renal neoplasms was not established.

7. Coherence of the association was also absent, as female mice and male and female rats did not display kidney effects. Also in the other four mouse carcinogenicity studies the mice did not develop similar neoplastic renal lesions.

8. The association does not demonstrate a dose-response pattern (see #5, 6), since the "in-study" females had neither neoplasms nor any of the other renal lesions, although they were exposed to higher levels of glyphosate. Consequently, under the conditions of this assessment, the renal neoplastic effects are not plausibly associated with glyphosate exposure. This conclusion is in agreement with that of Williams et al. (2000) and Greim et al. (2015).

With respect to haemangiosarcoma in male mice, in the CD-1 mouse study reported by Cheminova 1993b there were no statistically significant increases in the incidence of any tumors when compared with the control groups and no dose response was evident. IARC, based on their own statistical analysis (no reason was given for the choice of method) indicated/reported that there was an increase in the incidence of haemangiosarcoma in males [$P < 0.001$, Cochran-Armitage trend test] (**Table 1**). In addition, IARC (2015) did not comment on the lack of renal tumors in this mouse study.

Comment [JA20]: I don't think reduced latency is what Hill meant by temporality. Most interpret temporality as the exposure preceding the effect or occurring after a reasonable time period. So, an exposure that causes more of an illness at the time it usually occurs (e.g. smoking and lung cancer) does not violate Hill's sense of temporality.

Comment [wh21]: I DON T SEE A REASON FOR DELETING THE TEXT THAT JOHN DID BELOW

Comment [JA22]: Seems repetitive to say this again.

Comment [JA23]: Since Williams and Greim are panelists, it does not strengthen the argument to say there is agreement. Perhaps say, this reationale appears in published articles by Williams and Griem.

Comment [wh24]: I DISAGREE WITH JOHN. THERE WERE ADDITIONAL SCIENTISTS BESIDES WILLIAMS AND GREIM INVOLVED IN THOSE REVIEWS. SO IT DOES STRENGTHEN THE ARGUMENT

Comment [JA25]: Rather than criticize IARC, it seems better to say how the panel evaluated the evidence. You have mentioned previously the basis for IARC's judgments.

Comment [wh26]: I DISAGREE WITH JOHN I WOULD INCLUDE THE STATEMENT – IT IS A RELEVANT THAT THEY DID NOT PROVIDE A REASON FOR THEIR METHOD

Comment [JA27]: Is there some reason to question the Cochran-Armitage method in this instance?

Hemangiosarcomas in mice

If the likelihood of the occurrence of haemangiosarcoma is considered in terms of the recommended criteria ~~viewpoints~~ of Bradford Hill (Hill 1965), it is clear that the association is ~~weak, there is no strength in the association (Hill 1965).~~ For example, pairwise comparisons are not significant, there is no consistency (some mouse studies show no tumors of this type at all), and a dose/response effect is not seen (some HD groups have a lower incidence than lower doses). In terms of plausibility, recent studies emphasize both the frequency and the distinctive cellular origins of haemangiosarcomas in mice (Kakiuchi-Kiyota et al. 2013; Liu et al. 2013).

Given the foregoing analysis, the Expert Panel concludes that overall the evidence does not support the conclusion ~~there is no substantive evidence, based on the data available from the entire dataset,~~ that glyphosate exposure results in increased incidence of haemangiosarcoma in mice.

Comment [JA28]: Strength in Hill's paper does not refer to statistical significance. It refers to the size of the relative risk. Statistical significance depends on strength of the association and sample size. Here I assume they mean the number of excess tumors was small, they were sex specific, and other studies did not find the same results for males.

Comment [wh29]: I BELIEVE WE ARE SAYING THE SAME THING IN DIFFERENT WAYS

Comment [JA30]: This is unclear. Is the point that hemangiosarcoma is highly variable across studies?

Comment [wh31]: I CAN LIVE WITH EITHER

Liver tumors in rats

The IARC Working Group (WG) indicated that there was *"...a significant positive trend in the incidences of hepatocellular adenoma in males..."* (IARC 2015). ~~This opinion was~~ based on its interpretation of the Stout and Ruecker (1990) study as presented by the US EPA's Peer Review of Glyphosate (US EPA 1991a,b) (see **Table 2**)

The Stout and Ruecker (1990) study has been reviewed twice by the US EPA (1991a,b). The final interpretation of the US EPA Review committee was ~~appropriate~~: "*Despite the slight dose-related increase in hepatocellular adenomas in males, this increase was not significant in the pair-wise comparison with controls and was within the historical control range. Furthermore, there was no progression from adenoma to carcinoma and incidences of hyperplasia were not compound-related. Therefore, the slight increased occurrence of hepatocellular adenomas in*

males is not considered compound-related" (US EPA 1991b). The US EPA ultimately concluded that glyphosate should be classified as a Group E (evidence of non-carcinogenicity for humans) chemical (US EPA 1991a,b).

There are other aspects of the Stout and Ruecker (1990) data that support the conclusion that glyphosate did not exert an oncogenic effect on the liver of SD rats. For example, chemically-induced rat hepatocellular carcinogenesis is a multiple stage process characterized by progressive functional, morphological and molecular changes that indicate or precede the full establishment of neoplasia, such as enzyme induction, hepatocyte hypertrophy, degeneration and necrosis, hepatocyte proliferation, altered hepatocellullar foci, etc. (Williams 1980; Bannasch et al. 2003; Maronpot et al. 2010; Shah et al. 2011). Identification and analyses of these liver changes – that span from adaptive to irreversible toxic effects – can help support characterization of key events along the carcinogenesis process and inform the mode of action of the tested chemical (Williams & Iatropoulos 2002; Holsapple et al. 2006; Carmichael et al. 2011). These changes were not apparent in this study.

In the last 30 years the systemic carcinogenic potential of glyphosate has been assessed in at least eight studies in Sprague-Dawley or Wistar rats (Greim et al. 2015); a ninth could not be evaluated because of a high mortality and the LD used (Chruscielska et al. 2000). Considered jointly, the animals were exposed through the diet to 24 different doses distributed across a wide range of 3.0-1290.0 mg/kg body weight (bw)/d. In exposed males, the incidences of hepatocellular adenomas across the doses showed no dose-response relationship and varied within the same range as the controls. Similar rates were also seen for hepatocellular carcinomas. These observations confirm the absence of carcinogenic potential of glyphosate on the rat liver.

Pancreatic tumors in rats and mice

With respect to the pancreatic islet cell tumors, oral and dermal application of glyphosate to mice did not induce pancreatic islet tumors (Greim et al. 2015; IARC 2015). In two of the nine carcinogenicity studies in rats evaluated by IARC, tumors of islet cells of the pancreas were diagnosed in both males and females. Both studies were made available to IARC by the US EPA (1991a,b,c).

In the first study Sprague-Dawley rats received 0, 2000, 8000, and 20 000 ppm glyphosate (96.5% purity) in the diet, fed ad libitum for 24 months. In males, the following pancreatic islet cell tumor incidences were observed in the controls and three dose groups (low to high): adenoma: 1/58 (2%), 8/57 (14%), 5/60 (8%), 7/59 (12%); carcinoma: 1/58 (25), 0/57, 0/60, 0/59. Corresponding incidence values in females were: 5/60 (8%), 1/60 (2%), 4/60 (7%), 0/59 and 0/60, 0/60, 0/60, 0/59. The historical control rates for pancreatic islet cell tumors at the testing laboratory were in the range 1.8-8.5%. Despite the apparent increased tumor incidence, IARC concluded that there is no statistically positive trend in the incidence of pancreatic tumors and no apparent progression to carcinoma; the Expert Panel agrees with this conclusion.

In the second study Sprague-Dawley rats received doses of 0, 30, 100, and 300 ppm in the diet for 26 months. No pancreatic islet carcinomas were observed. Adenomas were found but without the positive trend seen in the study with higher doses. The tumor incidences for controls, low, mid, and high doses respectively are: males- 0/50, 5/49 (10%), 2/50 (4%), 2/50 (4%), and females- 2/50 (4%),1/50 (2%), 1/50 (2%) 0/50. As IARC noted, there was no statistically positive trend in the incidence of pancreatic tumors and, again, no apparent progression to carcinoma. Four additional studies in rats, described by Greim et al. (2015) not evaluated by IARC, similarly did not show pancreatic islet tumors. Based on this information the Expert Panel concludes that there is no evidence that glyphosate induces tumors in the pancreas.

Thyroid tumors in rats

As with the liver tumors, IARC's initial assessment (Guyton et al. 2015) did not mention a positive trend in the incidence of thyroid C-cell adenoma in females noted in the Monograph (IARC 2015). However, IARC later concluded that "there was also a statistically significant positive trend in the incidence of thyroid follicular cell adenoma in females (*P* = 0.031)." IARC based their opinion, again, on its interpretation of the Stout and Ruecker (1990) study and the US EPA's Second Peer Review of Glyphosate (US EPA 1991a). In the Stout and Ruecker study (1990), no statistically significant difference (group comparison) was reported in the incidence of thyroid C-cell neoplasms, as shown in **Table 3** below. Additionally, the US EPA (1991a) concluded that "the C-cell adenomas in males and females are not considered compound-related." Although the C-cell adenomas were slightly increased in male and female mid- and high- dose groups, there was no dose related progression to carcinoma and no significant dose-related increase in severity of grade or incidence of hyperplasia in either sex.

In sum, the Expert Panel is of the opinion that the ~~there is no reliable~~ evidence does not support a conclusion of ~~for~~ carcinogenic activity of glyphosate in experimental animals. Rather, ~~in fact,~~ the totality of the data would argue for evidence of non-carcinogenicity of glyphosate.

Genetic Toxicity and Oxidative Stress Data

The genetic toxicology Expert Panel considered published studies reviewed in the IARC monograph and some additional published studies identified by literature searches or from ~~in reviews articles that were not considered by IARC.~~ These included both genetic toxicology studies and studies of oxidative stress. A large number of core genetic toxicology regulatory studies were also considered for which information was available from review supplements. These regulatory studies were not considered in the IARC monograph but the Expert Panel

Comment [wh32]: I WOULD LEAVE THE DELETED PHRASE IN – IT IS GIVES CLARITY ABOUT IARC'S APPROACH – THIS IS NOT INFLAMMATORY, IT IS DESCRIPTIVE

concluded that sufficient information was available to justify including these studies. The universally recommended method for evaluating the databases of the type associated with glyphosate (including GBFs and AMPA), involves the application of a WOE approach as discussed recently for genetic toxicology testing (US FDA 2006; Dearfield et al. 2011). One of the most important requirements of a WOE approach is that individual test methods should be assigned a weight that is consistent with their contribution to the overall evidence, and different types of evidence or evidence categories must be weighted before they are combined into a WOE.

The weight of a category of evidence used in the Expert Panel evaluation is based on four considerations (i) Different categories of evidence (i.e. assay types) have different weights. (ii) The aggregate strength (robustness of protocols and reproducibility) and quality of evidence in the category also influence the weight (Klimisch et al. 1997), (iii) The number of pieces of evidence within a category influences the weight, and (iv) Tests with greater ability to extrapolate results to humans carry greater weight (e.g. test with non-human/mutated cell lines *vs* human donor derived cells). In general, human and *in vivo* mammalian systems have the highest test system weight, with a lower degree of weighting applied to *in vitro* mammalian cell systems and *in vivo* non-mammalian systems and lowest weight to *in vitro* non-mammalian systems (with the exception of the well validated bacterial reverse mutation-Ames test- using mammalian metabolic activation).

Publications in which glyphosate or GBFs have been tested for genotoxicity in a variety of non-mammalian species other than bacterial reverse mutation were included in the IARC review ~~and apparently had significant weight in the IARC evaluation.~~ Many of these studies used non-standard species (e.g. fish) and exposure protocols (e.g. inclusion of surfactants in water exposure) and DNA damage endpoints. The Expert Panel did not consider data from a majority of the non-mammalian systems and non-standard tests with glyphosate, GBF and AMPA to

Comment [wh33]: I THINK THIS SHOULD BE LEFT IN. IT IS AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION IN WHY THE PANEL CAME TO A DIFFERENT CONCLUSION. IT IS NOT AN INFLAMMATORY STATEMENT

have significant weight in the overall genotoxicity evaluation, especially given the large number of standard core studies in the more relevant gene mutation and chromosomal effects categories available in mammalian systems. Support for this Expert Panel view is the absence of internationally accepted guidelines for such non-mammalian test systems, lack of databases of acceptable negative control data or positive control responses, and no substantial results from validation studies suggesting concordance with rodent or human carcinogenicity. OECD guidelines specifically state that use of any non-standard tests require justification along with stringent validation including establishing robust historical negative and positive control databases (OECD 2014).

In addition, the IARC review seemed to apply significant weight to "indicator" tests such as DNA damage (comet assay) or SCE studies. These indicator tests are so called because the measured endpoint does not always lead to mutation, a change that can be passed on to subsequent generations. As stated by the OECD (2015), when evaluating potential genotoxicants, more weight should be given to the measurement of permanent DNA changes than to DNA damage events that are reversible. Therefore, the Expert Panel also considered that the data from these "indicator" tests with glyphosate, GBFs and AMPA should not have significant weight in the overall genotoxicity evaluation, especially given the large number of standard core studies in the more relevant gene mutation and chromosomal effects categories available in mammalian systems.

IARC did not consider the chemical structure of glyphosate in its mechanistic section. Many guidelines recommend that the presence of structural alerts be considered in evaluation of or testing for genotoxicity (Cimino et al. 2006; Eastmond et al. 2009; EFSA 2011; ICH 2011). As reported in Kier and Kirkland (2013), analysis of the glyphosate structure by DEREK software identified no structural alerts for chromosomal damage, genotoxicity, mutagenicity, or carcinogenicity. The lack of structural alerts in the glyphosate molecular structure would tend to

Comment [wh34]: AGAIN, I WOULD KEEP THIS IN. IT IS NOT INFLAMMATORY, AND IT NOTES THAT IARC DID NOT INCLUDE AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

suggests lack of genotoxicity or that genotoxic effects might be secondary to toxicity or resulting from mechanisms other than DNA-reactivity.

Genetic toxicology tests relied upon by most regulatory bodies to support decisions regarding safety focus on a set of core endpoints that are known to be involved either in direct activation of genes responsible for neoplastic initiation in somatic cells or alteration of the genetic information in germ cells (Kirkland et al 2011; ICH 2011; EFSA 2011). Therefore, the endpoints given the greatest weight in **Table 4** consist of gene mutation and chromosomal aberrations.

An evaluation of the studies in **Table 5** according to their relative contributions to a WOE produced the following results:

- Test methods identified as providing low contribution to the WOE (low weight) produced the highest frequency of positive responses, regardless of whether the responses were taken from the results of IARC evaluated studies alone (eight of nine) or from all studies combined (eight of 11).
- The highest frequencies of positive responses were reported for test endpoints and systems considered most likely to yield false or misleading positive results due to their susceptibility to secondary effects. This relationship was constant regardless of whether the results were taken from IARC evaluated studies alone or all studies combined.
- The numbers of studies providing strong evidence of relevant genotoxicity (high weight) were in the minority for both the IARC and the Expert Panel's evaluations, with six out of 15 studies identified as high weight being positive for the IARC evaluation, and only eight out of 92 studies identified as high weight being positive for all studies combined.

In summary, the WOE from *in vitro* and *in vivo* mammalian tests for genotoxicity indicates that:

- Glyphosate does not induce gene mutations *in vitro*. There are no *in vitro* mammalian cell gene mutation data for GBFs or AMPA, and no gene mutation data *in vivo*.
- Glyphosate, GBFs and AMPA are not clastogenic *in vitro*. Glyphosate is also not clastogenic *in vivo*. Some positive *in vivo* chromosome aberration studies with GBFs are all subject to concerns regarding their reliability or biological relevance.
- There is limited evidence that glyphosate induces micronuclei (MN) in *vitro*. Since it is not clastogenic this would suggest the possibility of threshold-mediated aneugenic effects. However, there is strong evidence that glyphosate does not induce MN *in vivo*.
- Limited studies and potential technical problems do not present convincing evidence that GBFs or AMPA induce MN *in vitro*. The overwhelming majority of *in vivo* MN studies on GBFs gave negative results, but conflicting and limited data do not allow a conclusion on *in vivo* induction of MN by AMPA.
- There is evidence that glyphosate and GBFs can induce DNA strand breaks *in vitro*, but these might be secondary to toxicity since they did not lead to chromosome breaks. There is limited evidence of transient DNA strand breakage for glyphosate and GBFs *in vivo*, but for glyphosate at least these are not associated with DNA adducts. These results are assigned a lower weight than results from other more relevant endpoints, which were in any case more abundant.
- There is evidence that glyphosate and AMPA do not induce UDS in cultured hepatocytes.
- Some reports of induction of SCE *in vitro* by glyphosate and GBFs, and one positive report of SCE induction *in vivo* by a GBF, do not contribute to the overall evaluation

of genotoxic potential since the mechanism of induction and biological relevance of SCE are unclear.

Although IARC policies prohibited the inclusion of additional data from unpublished studies or governmental reports, it was the Expert Panel's conclusion that the genetic toxicology studies published in reviews such as Kier and Kirkland (2013) (**Table 5**) should be included in a WOE assessment. The rationale supporting the inclusion of these 90 additional studies is that the supplementary tables presented in the Kier and Kirkland (2013) paper contain sufficient detail concerning the robustness of the studies. Failure to evaluate and consider the large number of results included in the publication by Kier and Kirkland (2013) ~~as well as other publicly available studies not reviewed by IARC,~~ results in an inaccurate assessment of glyphosate, GBFs and AMPA's genotoxic hazard/risk potential.

Comment [wh35]: I BELIEVE YOU SHOULD RETAIN THE STATEMENTS BELOW THAT JOHN DELETED. IT IS NOT INFLAMMATORY. IT IS AN IMPORTANT STATEMENT OF IARC'S METHODS VS. THE EXPERT PANEL

Based on the results of the WOE critique detailed above and the wealth of ~~negative~~ regulatory studies reviewed by Kier and Kirkland (2013) and Williams et al. (2000), the Expert Panel concluded that the available data ~~does not agree with IARC's conclusion that there is strong evidence for genotoxicity across the glyphosate or GBFs database. In fact the Expert Panel's WOE assessment~~ provide~~s~~ strong support for a *lack* of genotoxicity, particularly in key study categories (mutation, chromosomal effects) considered relevant for or mechanistically associated with carcinogen prediction. As additional

Comment [wh36]: I BELIEVE THE STATEMENT BELOW SHOULD BE RETAINED. IT IS NOT INFLAMMATORY. IT IS A STATEMENT OF DISAGREEMENT THAT THE GENETOX EXPERTS FELT STRONGLY ABOUT. IT IS IN THE GENETOX SECTION OF THE DOCUMENT, SO IT SHOULD REFLECT THEIR BELIEF.

~~To p~~support for ~~revide greater emphasis to~~ the Expert Panel's WOE conclusion, **Table 6** provides a comparison between a set of characteristics found in confirmed genotoxic carcinogens (Bolt et al. 2004; Petkov et al. 2015) and the genotoxic activity profiles for glyphosate, AMPA and GBFs. There is virtually no concordance between the two sets of characteristics.

Beyond the standard genetic toxicity assays, IARC concluded for humans exposed to GBFs that there was positive evidence of DNA breakage as determined using the comet assay Paz-y-Miño et al. (2007), negative induction of chromosome aberrations (Paz-y-Miño et al. 2011), and positive induction of micronuclei (Bolognesi et al. 2009). These papers were critically reviewed by the Expert Panel and were found to be deficient as evidence for GBF effects for many reasons (e.g. identification of cells scored for comets, inconsistent observations, uncertainties with respect to "negative controls", lack of statistical significance, and lack of effect relative to self-reported exposure). In addition to questions about the significance of the comet endpoint there is also a lack of scientific consensus regarding the relevance of micronuclei found in exposed humans (Speit 2013; Kirsch-Volders et al. 2014). ~~The IARC Monograph placed special emphasis on the micronucleus study and qualifications for this study in the Monograph Mechanistic and Other Relevant Data section were not subsequently mentioned in the Monograph Evaluation and Rationale sections.~~ Important, very significant findings for the Bolognesi ~~is~~ study were that increases in micronuclei were not significantly correlated with self-reported GBF spray exposure and were not consistent with application rates. The Expert Panel concluded that, there was little or no reliable evidence produced in these studies that would support a conclusion that GBFs, at levels experienced across a broad range of end-user exposures, poses any human genotoxic hazard/risk.

Comment [wh37]: I AM OK WITH DELETING THIS SENTENCE

With respect to oxidative stress and genotoxic potential of glyphosate and its formulations, it is noted that many more oxidative stress studies are available for GBFs than for glyphosate or AMPA. A higher proportion of the GBF studies show evidence of oxidative stress. This might be consistent with induction of oxidative stress by GBF components such as surfactants. IARC's statement that there is strong ~~IARC claims of strong e~~Eevidence supporting oxidative stress from AMPA seems to result from glyphosate and particularly GBF results rather than AMPA

[PAGE * MERGEFORMAT]

results. In fact, oxidative stress studies of AMPA are very limited. The paucity of cited data does not seem to justify a conclusion of strong evidence for oxidative stress induction by AMPA.

One mechanism connecting oxidative stress to induction of carcinogenicity is oxidative damage to DNA and the generation of mutagenic lesions. Most of the endpoints used in oxidative stress studies cited by IARC are response endpoints and the number of studies examining oxidative DNA damage are very few and with mixed results. Further, research on oxidative stress induced genotoxicity suggests that it is often a secondary response to toxicity and characterized by a threshold (Pratt & Barron 2003). Comparison of GBF oxidative stress study results with predicted human exposure levels of less than 0.064 mg/kg bw/d, suggests that it is not likely that GBFs would induce oxidative stress likely to exceed endogenous detoxification capacities.

The most appropriate conclusion supported by the oxidative stress data ~~presented in the IARC Monograph (Section 4.2.3 of the IARC review)~~ is, based on a WOE approach, that there is no strong evidence that glyphosate, GBFs or AMPA produce oxidative damage to DNA that would lead to induction of endpoints predictive of a genotoxic hazard or act as a mechanism for the induction of cancer in experimental animals or humans.

A thorough WOE review of genotoxicity data does not indicate that glyphosate, GBFs or AMPA possess the properties of genotoxic hazards or genotoxic mechanisms of carcinogenesis

Epidemiological Data

The epidemiology panelists conducted a systematic review of the published glyphosate literature for the two cancers that were the focus of IARC's epidemiology review: non-Hodgkin's lymphoma (NHL) and multiple myeloma (MM). Their approach was implemented to be consistent with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines for systematic reviews (Moher et al. 2009). Initially, an exhaustive search

of the medical literature was performed to identify all epidemiological studies that examined the relationships between reported use of glyphosate and NHL or MM. This resulted in seven unique studies for NHL and four studies for MM after removal of duplicates and focusing on the most recent findings for study populations that were the subject of more than one publication. Each study was then reviewed individually according to key validity considerations specified a priori and the results for NHL and MM separately were evaluated systematically according to widely used criteria for judging causal associations from epidemiologic studies (Hill 1965).

Data abstracted from each study included: first author, year of publication, outcome (NHL, MM), study design, study size, statistical methods, results (measure of relative risk [RR] with accompanying 95% confidence interval [95% CI]), exposure-response findings, and variables controlled in the analyses. Each study was evaluated for key features that relate to study validity, most importantly: recall bias, proxy respondents, selection bias, adequate statistical control for confounding, and evaluation of dose response (**Table 7**).

Of the seven NHL studies, only one study – the Agricultural Health Study (AHS) cohort study (De Roos et al. 2005) – was devoid of major concerns about recall bias and selection bias by virtue of the design, controlled comprehensively for confounding factors, and extensively considered relative risk by frequency and duration of glyphosate use. This study of more than 50,000 licensed pesticide farmers and applicators collected information about pesticide use before follow-up for health outcomes, had only firsthand respondents reporting about pesticide use (viz. no proxy respondents), had minimal potential for selection bias, and included statistical analyses that controlled confounding by myriad personal characteristics and non-glyphosate occupational exposures. In addition, De Roos et al. (2005) were the only investigators who conducted exposure-response analyses while controlling extensively for confounding exposures. In contrast, the NHL case control studies had major validity concerns including the strong potential for recall bias, selection bias (either appreciably lesser participation for controls

than cases or selecting controls that clearly did not reflect the population that gave rise to the cases [e.g. hospitals controls from rheumatology and orthopedic departments]), proxy respondents, and uncontrolled confounding in the statistical analyses. Indeed, in many of the case control studies virtually every pesticide exposure studied was associated with increased risk for NHL (or MM) – a clear indication of widespread systematic bias.

With these considerations in mind, for NHL, the results of the De Roos et al. (2005) cohort study were considered the only dependable epidemiologic findings. As De Roos et al. (2005) concluded "... the available data provided evidence of no association between glyphosate exposure and NHL incidence." Results from this study drove the panel's conclusion of no epidemiologic support for a relationship between reported glyphosate use and NHL.

The glyphosate literature for MM is appreciably sparser than the literature for NHL, both in terms of the number of available studies (one cohort and three case control studies) and the number of cases in those studies with reported glyphosate use. The three case control studies had important validity concerns, as noted for the NHL case control studies, and were unable to adjust analyses comprehensively for confounding factors due to the very small number of exposed cases. The AHS cohort study (De Roos et al. 2005 and re-analyzed by Sorahan 2015) found that glyphosate users had about the same rate of MM as non-users adjusting for confounding factors, but had too few exposed cases to conduct informative exposure response analyses. Overall, then, the available literature was considered inadequate to make an informed judgment about a potential relationship between glyphosate and MM.

In summary, the Expert Panel concluded that the glyphosate epidemiologic literature does not indicate a relationship with glyphosate exposure and NHL. For MM, the evidence was considered too sparse to judge a relationship between MM and reported glyphosate use.

Discussion and Conclusions

The expert panel focused on glyphosate exposure, animal carcinogenicity, genotoxicity, and epidemiologic studies. IARC (2015), in their assessment and categorization process do not consider exposure and relevance of exposure in terms of dose and temporal pattern to toxicology and epidemiology findings. With respect to exposure, s to glyphosate, even when using a number of worst-case assumptions, systemic doses of glyphosate in human applicators, bystanders, and the general public are very small. Those in the general public are three or more orders of magnitude less than the US EPA's RfD, which is the allowable limit of daily exposure derived from toxicity studies and in the most exposed applicators (90th centile) the systemic dose was estimated at 20-fold less that the RfD. Most exposures are in the range of 0.00001-0.01 mg/kg bw/d and this includes occupational exposures. Exposures in this range cannot plausibly be associated with a measurable (i.e. in experimental animals or in epidemiology studies) increase in cancer risk and therefore even a potent genotoxic carcinogen would have minimal risk at such low exposure levels. Overall, the exposure to glyphosate is clearly shown to be so low as to negate the concerns implicit in the IARC process; however, IARC's non-standard process leads them to interpret study data differently from those groups informed about the relevant science.

In addition, in the current IARC (2015) assessment of glyphosate, any numerical increase in tumors, sometimes identified only after statistical manipulation, might be considered a treatment-related effect regardless of what the data from the study indicated. Furthermore, IARC's evaluation didn't consider all relevant data or to apply an overall WOE approach from the full data sets for animal carcinogenicity, genotoxicity, and epidemiology studies. In contrast, the Expert panel included a number of additional studies which were available for analysis within their overall evaluation. Therefore, IARC's disregard of valid data without explanation cannot be considered to be a reasonable practice.

Comment [wh38]: I AM OK WITH DELETING THE STATEMENT BELOW

Comment [wh39]: I BELIEVE THE 1ST SENTENCE BELOW SHOULD BE RETAINED – IT REFLECTS THE EXPERT PANEL'S VIEW. I CAN LIVE WITH DELETING THE REST OF THE TEXT BELOW

[PAGE * MERGEFORMAT]

With respect to the cancer bioassay data, ~~the~~ Eexpert Ppanel conducted a thorough overall WOE evaluation that considered a much wider range of studies than IARC, all of which met GLP guidelines and ~~it appears to the Expert panel that in the IARC working group review there was considerable selectivity in the choice of data reviewed. An example of how an informative data set was disregarded was highlighted in the paper of Greim et al. (2015) where a total of fourteen carcinogenicity studies, nine chronic/carcinogenicity studies in the rat, including one peer-reviewed published study, and five carcinogenicity studies with glyphosate in mice were evaluated. All these studies~~ were submitted to support glyphosate Annex I renewal in the European Union. These studies provided evidence that neoplasms naturally occurring in rodents are widely represented in non-exposed animals, as well as those exposed to doses well below those that might be expected in regulatory studies. The pattern of occurrence of these tumors was found to be inconsistent across and within species and no "novel" neoplasms appeared; progression of non-neoplastic to neoplastic lesions also was not seen. Further, the comparatively large number of studies performed ~~might~~ would be expected to lead to several "positive" results by chance. In fact, Haseman (1983) has estimated that the overall false positive rate for animal bioassays that tested both sexes in two species, because of multiple comparisons, corresponds to 7-8% significance level for the study as a whole; the U.S. FDA has estimated that the overall rate can approach 10%.

~~A number of scientific groups, regulatory agencies and individuals have commented positively on these data and that the actual comments can be found in the Animal Bioassay chapter/paper.~~

After review of all available glyphosate carcinogenicity data, the panel concludes:

Comment [wh40]: I CAN LIVE WITH DELETING THE NEXT 2 SECTIONS SHOWN BELOW

Comment [JA41]: In general, this is a weak comment. I'd delete it.

Comment [wh42]: THE DELETED STATEMENT BELOW HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH IARC CRITICISM AND SHOULD BE PUT BACK IN. JOHN OVER-STEPPED THE BOUNDS HERE

(i) the renal neoplastic effects are not associated with glyphosate exposure, because they lack statistical significance strength, consistency, specificity, lack a dose-response pattern, plausibility, and coherence;

Comment [JA43]: You need to clean up any misuse of Hill's "criteria"

Comment [wh44]: THE COMMENT ABOVE HAS ALREADY BEEN ADDRESSED

(ii) the ~~strength of~~ association of haemangiosarcomas in the liver of mice is ~~absent~~weak, lack~~ings~~ consistency, and there as no ~~a~~ dose-response effect;

(iii) the ~~strength of~~ association of pancreatic islet-cell adenomas in male SD rats is weak~~absent~~, not seen in the majority of rat studies, lack~~ings~~ a dose-response pattern (the highest incidence is in the low dose followed by the high dose), plausibility and pre-neoplastic/malignant effects;

(iv) in one of two studies, the significant positive trend in the incidence of hepatocellular adenomas in male rats did not materialize, no progression to malignancy was evident and no glyphosate-associated pre-neoplastic lesions were present;

(v) in one of two studies, the significant positive trend in the incidence of thyroid C-cell adenomas in female rats did not materialize, although the adenomas were only slightly increased in mid and high doses, also there was no progression to malignancy.

Comment [wh45]: I CAN LIVE WITH DELETING THE STATEMENT BELOW

~~A pattern of selective review of the data is also very evident in the IARC (2015) assessment of the genotoxicity data.~~ Overall, extensive reviews of the genotoxicity of glyphosate, AMPA and GBFs that were available prior to the development of the IARC Glyphosate Monograph all support a conclusion that glyphosate (and related materials) is inherently not genotoxic. Further, evidence indicative of an oxidative stress mechanism of carcinogenicity is largely unconvincing. The Expert Panel concluded that there is no new, valid evidence ~~presented in the IARC Monograph~~ that would provide a basis for altering these conclusions. ~~The differences between the conclusions of the IARC review and the Expert Panel review were in large part due~~

Comment [wh46]: I THINK THE PHRASE BELOW SHOULD BE RETAINED – IT IS NOT INFLAMMATORY

Comment [wh47]: WHILE I BELIEVE THE STATEMENTS BELOW ARE TRUE, I CAN LIVE WITH REMOVING THEM FROM THIS SECTION

to IARC exclusion of numerous available studies and in some cases differences in interpretation of study results reported in the IARC monograph. Another significant source of difference was the Panel's weighting of different studies and endpoints by the strength of their linkage to mutagenic events associated with carcinogenic mechanisms. The Expert Panel concluded that without critically evaluating all available data, it is not possible to make an accurate WOE assessment.

Lastly, The final set of data on which IARC (2015) based their conclusion was the epidemiology data with respect to glyphosate exposure/use in relation to the incidence of NHL and MM. The Expert Panel's review of the glyphosate epidemiologic literature and the application of commonly applied causal principles did not indicate a relationship with glyphosate exposure and NHL. In addition, the Panel considered the evidence for MM to be inadequate to judge a relationship with glyphosate. The extremely large margin of safety found in exposure monitoring studies is considered to be supportive of these conclusions. The maximum systemic dose found in a review of all glyphosate biomonitoring studies completed to date is 0.004 mg/kg (Niemann et al. 2015). For comparison, the US EPA's reference dose (viz. the daily oral exposure to the human population, including sensitive subgroups such as children, that is not likely to cause harmful effects during a lifetime) is 500-fold higher at 1.75 mg/kg/d (US EPA 1993). The geometric mean systemic glyphosate dose for applicators is 0.0001 mg/kg/d. It is not plausible that an excess cancer risk could, if it indeed existed, could be detected given these levels of exposures. This argues strongly against the purported associations concluded by IARC to indicate "*limited*" evidence of carcinogenicity in humans. Moreover, a close inspection of the studies relied upon by IARC reveals a number of issues regarding the validity of the studies, not the least of which include selection bias, recall bias, inadequate/inappropriate measures of exposures, and confounding exposures to other chemicals. The study with the least amount of

Comment [wh48]: THE SENTENCE BELOW CAN BE DELETED

Comment [wh49]: I CAN LIVE WITH DELETING THE TEXT BELOW, ASSUMING THAT EXPOSURE TEXT ABOVE (SEE COMMENT [WH39]) IS ADDED BACK IN

~~methodological issues. De Roos et al. (2005), shows no indication that glyphosate exposure is associated with increased risk for NHL.~~

At the end of the day, the totality of the evidence, especially in light of the extensive testing that glyphosate has received, as judged by the Expert Panel, does not support the conclusion that glyphosate is a "probable human carcinogen". Indeed, the data, inclusive of GLP-compliant unpublished studies, point to classification of "non-carcinogenic to humans". ~~The IARC (2015) classification is flawed due to the selective review/analysis of data (especially the cancer bioassay and genetic toxicity data), lack of transparency in regards to data analysis, and most importantly, the lack of consideration of biological plausibility in light of exposure. In essence, the IARC (2015) "misclassification" of glyphosate is both the result of the hazard only paradigm employed and the selective/biased nature of the data reviewed and considered for analysis.~~

Comment [wh50]: I CAN LIVE WITH DELETING THE TEXT BELOW

References

Acquavella JF, Alexander BH, Mandel JS, Gustin C, Baker B, Chapman P, Bleeke M. 2004. Glyphosate biomonitoring for farmers and their families: results from the Farm Family Exposure Study. Environ Health Perspect. 112:321-326.

Arysta Life Sciences. 1997. HR-001: 18-month oral oncogenicity study in mice. Tokyo (Japan): The Institute of Environmental Toxicology. Cited In: Greim et al. 2015 [As: Arysta Life Sciences 1997a].

Bannasch P, Haertel T, Su Q. 2003. Significance of hepatic preneoplasia in risk identification and early detection of neoplasia. Toxicol Pathol. 31:134-139.

Bolognesi C, Carrasquilla G, Volpi S, Solomon KR, Marshall EJP. 2009. Biomonitoring of genotoxic risk in agricultural workers from five Colombian regions: association to occupational exposure to glyphosate. J Toxicol Environ Health. A 72:986-997. Cited In: IARC 2015.

Bolt HM, Foth H, Hengstler JG, Degen GH. 2004. Carcinogenicity categorization of chemicals-new aspects to be considered in a European perspective. Toxicol Lett. 151:29-41.

Brown LM, Burmeister GD, Everett GD, Blair A. 1993. Pesticide exposures and multiple myeloma in Iowa men. Cancer Causes Control. 4:153-156. Cited In: IARC 2015.

Carmichael N, Bausen M, Boobis AR, Cohen SM, Embry M, Fruijtier-Pölloth C, Greim H, Lewis R, Meek ME, Mellor H, Vickers C, Doe J. 2011. Using mode of action information to improve regulatory decision-making: an ECETOC/ILSI RF/HESI workshop overview. Crit Rev Toxicol. 41:175-186.

Chang FC, Simcik MF, Capel PD. 2011. Occurrence and fate of the herbicide glyphosate and its degradate aminomethylphosphonic acid in the atmosphere. Environ Toxicol Chem. 30:548-555.

Cheminova. 1993a. Glyphosate: 104 week dietary carcinogenicity study in mice. [Unpublished Report] Tranent (Scotland): Inveresk Research International, Ltd. Submitted to WHO by Lemvig (Denmark): Cheminova A/S. (Report No. 7793, IRI project No. 438618). Cited In: Greim et al. 2015 [As: Cheminova 1993b]; Cited In: JMPR 2006 [As: Atkinson et al. 1993a].

Cheminova. 1993b. 104 week combined chronic feeding/oncogenicity study in rats with 52 week interim kill (results after 104 weeks). [Unpublished Report] Tranent (Scotland): Inveresk Research International, Ltd. Submitted to WHO by Lemvig (Denmark): Cheminova A/S. (Report No. 7867, IRI project No. 438623). Cited In: Greim et al. 2015 [As: Cheminova 1993a]. Cited In: JMPR 2006 [As: Atkinson et al. 1993b].

Chruscielska K, Brzezinski J, Kita K, Kalhorn D, Kita I, Graffstein B, Korzeniowski P. 2000. Glyphosate – evaluation of chronic activity and possible far-reaching effects. Part 1. Studies on chronic toxicity. Pestycydy (Warsaw). (3/4):11-20. Cited In: Greim et al. 2015 [As: Chruscielska et al. 2000a].

Cimino MC. 2006. Comparative overview of current international strategies and guidelines for genetic toxicology testing for regulatory purposes. Environ Mol Mutagen. 47:362-390.

Cocco P, Satta G, Dubois S, Pili C, Pilleri M, Zucca M, 't Mannetje AM, Becker N, Benavente Y, de Sanjosé S, et al. 2013. Lymphoma risk and occupational exposure to pesticides: results of the Epilymph study. Occup Environ Med. 70:91-98.

Curwin BD, Hein MJ, Sanderson WT, Striley C, Heederik D, Kromhout H, Reynolds SJ, Alavanja MC. 2007. Urinary pesticide concentrations among children, mothers and fathers living in farm and non-farm households in Iowa. Ann Occup Hyg. 51:53-65.

De Roos AJ, Blair A, Rusiecki JA, Hoppin JA, Svec M, Dosemeci M, Sandler DP, Alavanja MC. 2005. Cancer incidence among glyphosate-exposed pesticide applicators in the Agricultural Health Study. Environ Health Perspect. 113:49-54. Cited In: IARC 2015 [As De Roos et al. 2005a].

Dearfield KL, Thybaud V, Cimino MC, Custer L, Czich A, Harvey JS, Hester S, Kim JH, Kirkland D, Levy DD, et al. 2011. Follow-up actions from positive results of in vitro genetic toxicity testing. Environ Mol Mutagen. 52:177-204.

Eastmond DA, Hartwig A, Anderson D, Anwar WA, Cimino MC, Dobrev I, Douglas GR, Nohmi T, Phillips DH, Vickers C. 2009. Mutagenicity testing for chemical risk assessment: update of the WHO/IPCS Harmonized Scheme. Mutagenesis. 24:341-349.

EFSA. 2011. Scientific Opinion on genotoxicity testing strategies applicable to food and feed safety assessment (EFSA Scientific Committee) (Question no EFSA-Q-2009-00782, adopted on 13 September 2011 by European Food Safety Authority, 3 October 2012, replaces the earlier version). EFSA J. 9:2379. [69 pp.]. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2011.2379. Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2379.htm"].

Eriksson M, Hardell L, Carlberg M, Akerman M. 2008. Pesticide exposure as risk factor for non-Hodgkin lymphoma including histopathological subgroup analysis. Int J Cancer. 123:1657-1663. Cited In: IARC 2015.

European Commission. 2002. Review report for the active substance glyphosate. Finalised in the Standing Committee on Plant Health at its meeting on 29 June 2001 in view of the inclusion of glyphosate in Annex I of Directive 91/414/EEC. Brussels (Belgium): European Commission (EC), Health and Consumer Protection Directorate General. (6511/VI/99-Final). Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://ec.europa.eu/food/fs/sfp/ph_ps/pro/eva/existing/list1_glyphosate_en.pdf"].

Feinchemie Schwebda. 2001. Carcinogenicity study with glyphosate technical in Swiss Albino mice. [Unpublished Report] Bangalore (India): Rallis India, Ltd. Cited In: Greim et al. 2015.

Greim H, Saltmiras D, Mostert V, Strupp C. 2015. Evaluation of carcinogenic potential of the herbicide glyphosate, drawing on tumor incidence data from fourteen chronic/carcinogenicity rodent studies. Crit Rev Toxicol. 45:185-208.

Guyton KZ, Loomis D, Grosse Y, El Ghissassi F, Benbrahim-Tallaa L, Guha N, Scoccianti C, Mattock H, Straif K. 2015. Carcinogenicity of tetrachlorvinphos, parathion, malathion, diazinon, and glyphosate International Agency for Research on Cancer Monograph Working Group, IARC, Lyon, France. Lancet Oncol. 16:490-491.

Hardell L, Eriksson M, Nordström M. 2002. Exposure to pesticides as risk factor for non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and hairy cell leukemia: Pooled analysis of two Swedish case-control studies. Leuk Lymphoma. 43:1043-1049. Cited In: IARC 2015.

Health and Welfare Canada. 1991. Preharvest application of glyphosate (Roundup) herbicide. Ottawa (ON): Health and Welfare Canada, Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA), Plant Industry Directorate. Pesticide Information Division. (Pesticides Directorate Discussion Document, Vol. 91, Iss. 1), 92 p.

Hill AB. 1965. The environment and disease: association or causation. J R Soc Med. 58:295-300.

Holsapple MP, Pitot HC, Cohen SM, Boobis AR, Klaunig JE, Pastoor T, Dellarco VL, Dragan YP. 2006. Mode of action in relevance of rodent liver tumors to human cancer risk. Toxicol Sci. 89:51-56.

Honeycutt Z, Rowlands H. 2014. Glyphosate testing report: findings in American mothers' breast milk, urine and water. Moms Across America & Sustainable Pulse, 19 p. Available from: [HYPERLINK "https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/yesmaam/pages/774/attachments/original/1396803706/Glyphosate__Final__in_the_breast_milk_of_American_women_Draft6_.pdf?1396803706"].

Hoppe H-W. 2013. Determination of glyphosate residue in human urine samples from 18 European countries. Bremen (Germany): Medical Laboratory Bremen. (Report Glyphosate MLHB-2013-06-06), 18 p. Available from: [HYPERLINK "https://www.bund.net/fileadmin/bundnet/pdfs/gentechnik/130612_gentechnik_bund_glyphosat_urin_analyse.pdf"].

IARC. 2015. Glyphosate. In: Some organophosphate insecticides and herbicides: diazinon, glyphosate, malathion, parathion, tetrachlorvinphos. IARC Working Group, March 3-10, 2015, Lyon (France). Lyon (France): World Health Organization (WHO), International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). (IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogen Risks to Humans, vol 112), p. 1-92. Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol112/index.php"].

ICH. 1997. Testing for carcinogenicity of pharmaceuticals: S1B. Geneva: International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). (ICH Harmonised Tripartite Guideline - Current Step 4 version dated 16 July 1997). Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://www.ich.org/products/guidelines/safety/article/safety-guidelines.html"] [Open S1B].

ICH. 2011. Guidance on Genotoxicity Testing and Data Interpretation for Pharmaceuticals Intended for Human Use: S2(R1). Geneva (Switzerland): International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). (ICH Harmonised Tripartite Guideline - Current Step 4 version [Combines S2A & S2B]). Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://www.ich.org/products/guidelines/safety/article/safety-guidelines.html"].

JMPR. 2014. 5.21. Glyphosate (158) and metabolites. In: Pesticide residues in food 2013. Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Core Assessment Group on Pesticide Residues, Geneva,17 to 26 September 2013. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations / Geneva, World Health Organization (WHO). (FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper No. 219), p. 225-228, 484-486. Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/299ca869-ae51-5093-8407-9cb30782b9f5/"].

Jönsson J, Camm R, Hall T. 2013. Removal and degradation of glyphosate in water treatment: A review. Aqua. 62:395-408.

Kachuri L, Demers PA, Blair A, Spinelli JJ, Pahwa M, McLaughlin JR, Pahwa P, Dosman JA, Harris SA. 2013. Multiple pesticide exposures and the risk of multiple myeloma in Canadian men. Int J Cancer. 133:1846-1858. Cited In: IARC 2015.

Kakiuchi-Kiyota S, Crabbs TA, Arnold LL, Pennington KL, Cook JC, Malarkey DE, Cohen SM. 2013. Evaluation of expression profiles of hematopoietic stem cell, endothelial cell, and myeloid cell antigens in spontaneous and chemically induced hemangiosarcomas and hemangiomas in mice. Toxicol Pathol. 41:709-721.

Kier LD, Kirkland DJ. 2013. Review of genotoxicity studies of glyphosate and glyphosate-based formulations. Crit Rev Toxicol. 43:283-315.

Kirkland D, Reeve L, Gatehouse D, Vanparys P. 2011. A core in vitro genotoxicity battery comprising the Ames test plus the in vitro micronucleus test is sufficient to detect rodent carcinogens and in vivo genotoxins. Mutat Res. 721:27-73.

Kirsch-Volders M, Bonassi S, Knasmueller S, Holland N, Bolognesi C, Fenech MF. 2014. Commentary: critical questions, misconceptions and a road map for improving the use of the lymphocyte cytokinesis-block micronucleus assay for in vivo biomonitoring of human exposure to genotoxic chemicals-a HUMN project perspective. Mutat Res Rev Mutat Res. 759:49-58.

Klimisch H-J, Andreae M, Tillmann U. 1997. A systematic approach for evaluating the quality of experimental toxicological and ecotoxicological data. Regul Toxicol Pharmacol. 25:1-5. Cited In: Greim et al. 2015.

Krüger M, Schledorn P, Shrödl W, Wolfgang Hoppe H, Lutz W, Shehata AA. 2014. Detection of glyphosate residues in animals and humans. J Environ Anal Toxicol. 4:210. doi: 10.4172/2161-0525.1000210.

Liu L, Kakiuchi-Kiyota S, Arnold LL, Johansson SL, Wert D, Cohen SM. 2013. Pathogenesis of human hemangiosarcomas and hemangiomas. Hum Pathol. 44:2302-2311.

Markard C. 2014. Ergebnisse der Vorstudie HBM von Glyphosat. Dessau-Roßlau (Germany): Federal Environmental Agency (UBA), Umweltprobenbank des Bundes. [Unpublished Report provided to] Berlin (Germany): German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR).

Maronpot RR, Yoshizawa K, Nyska A, Harada T, Flake G, Mueller G, Singh B, Ward JM. 2010. Hepatic enzyme induction: histopathology. Toxicol Pathol. 38:776-795.

McDuffie HH, Pahwa P, McLaughlin JR, Spinelli JJ, Fincham S, Dosman JA, Robson D, Skinnider LF, Choi NW. 2001. Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and specific pesticide exposures in men: Cross-Canada study of pesticides and health. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 10:1155-1163. Cited In: IARC 2015.

Mesnage R, Moesch C, Grand R, Lauthier G, Vendômois J, Gress S, Séralini G. 2012. Glyphosate exposure in a farmer's family. J Environ Protect 3:1001-1003.

Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. 2009. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA Statement. Ann Intern Med. 151:264-269, W264.

Monsanto. 1983. A chronic feeding study of glyphosate (Roundup ® technical) in mice. [Unpublished Report]. East Millstone (NJ): Bio/dynamics, Inc. (Project #77-2062, 1981). Cited In: Greim et al. 2015.

Niemann L, Sieke C, Pfeil R, Solecki R. 2015. A critical review of glyphosate findings in human urine samples and comparison with the exposure of operators and consumers. J Verbr Lebensm. 10:3-12.

Nufarm. 2009. Glyphosate technical: dietary carcinogenicity study in the mouse. [Unpublished Report] Derbyshire (UK): Harlan Laboratories Ltd. Cited In: Greim et al. 2015 [As: Nufarm 2009a].

OECD. 2014. Guidance document for describing non-guideline in vitro test methods. Paris, France: Joint Meeting of the Chemicals Committee and the Working Party on Chemicals, Pesticides, and Biotechnology. Paris (France): Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Environment Directorate, Health and Safety Publications. (Series on Testing and Assessment no 211; ENV/JM/MONO(2014)35). Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=ENV/JM/MONO(2014)35&doclanguage=en"].

OECD. 2015. Genetic toxicology guidance document: guidance document on revisions to OECD genetic toxicology test guidelines. Paris (France): Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Environment Directorate, Health and Safety Publications Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://www.oecd.org/chemicalsafety/testing/Genetic%20Toxicology%20Guidance%20Document%20Aug%2031%202015.pdf"].

Orsi L, Delabre L, Monnereau A, Delval P, Berthou C, Fenaux P, Marit G, Soubeyran P, Huguet F, Milpied N, et al. 2009. Occupational exposure to pesticides and lymphoid neoplasms among men: results of a French case-control study. Occup Environ Med. 66:291-298. Cited In: IARC 2015.

Paz-y-Miño C, Muñoz MJ, Maldonado A, Valladares C, Cumbal N, Herrera C, Robles P, Sánchez ME, López-Cortés A. 2011. Baseline determination in social, health, and genetic areas in communities affected by glyphosate aerial spraying on the northeastern Ecuadorian border. Rev Environ Health. 26:45-51. Cited In: IARC 2015.

Paz-y-Miño C, Sánchez ME, Arévalol M, Muñoz MJ, Wittel T, Oleas De-la-Carreral G, Leonel PE II. 2007. Evaluation of DNA damage in an Ecuadorian population exposed to glyphosate. Genet Mol Biol. 30:456-460. Cited In: IARC 2015.

Petkov PI, Patlewicz G, Schultz TW, Honma M, Todorov M, Kotov S, Dimitrov SD, Donner EM, Mekenyan OG. 2015. A feasibility study: can information collected to classify for mutagenicity be informative in predicting carcinogenicity? Regul Toxicol Pharmacol. 72:17-25.

Pratt IS, Barron T. 2003. Regulatory recognition of indirect genotoxicity mechanisms in the European Union. Toxicol Lett. 140/141:53-62.

Shah SH, Parameswaran S, Hickey N, Zetler S, Nathan M. 2011. Multifocal intraepithelial neoplasia and the psychological consequence of vulvectomy. BMJ Case Rep. 2011. pii: bcr0220113827. doi: 10.1136/bcr.02.2011.3827.

Sorahan, T. 2015. Multiple myeloma and glyphosate use: a re-analysis of US agricultural health study (AHS) data. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 12:1548-1559.

Speit G. 2013. Does the recommended lymphocyte cytokinesis-block micronucleus assay for human biomonitoring actually detect DNA damage induced by occupational and environmental exposure to genotoxic chemicals? Mutagenesis. 28:375-380.

Stout LD, Ruecker FA. 1990. Chronic study of glyphosate administered in feed to Albino rats. [Unpublished Report] St Louis (MO): Monsanto Agricultural Company. (No. MSL-10495, job/project No. ML-87-148/EHL 87122). Cited In: JMPR 2006.

Suter GW II, Cormier SM. 2011. Why and how to combine evidence in environmental assessments: weighing evidence and building cases. Sci Total Environ. 409:1406-1417.

US EPA. 1990. Determination of glyphosate in drinking water by direct-aqueous-injection HPLC, post column derivatization, and fluorescence detection. In: Methods for the determination of organic compound in drinking water – supplement I. Washington (DC): U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), Office of Research and Development. (EPA/600/4-90/020). Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/30000UX8.PDF?Dockey=30000UX8.PDF"].

US EPA. 1991a. Second peer review of glyphosate [memo]. Washington (DC): U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA). Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://archive.epa.gov/pesticides/chemicalsearch/chemical/foia/web/html/103601.html"].

US EPA. 1991b. Glyphosate; 2-year combined chronic toxicity/carcinogenicity study in Sprague-Dawley rats – list A pesticide for reregistration [memo]. Washington (DC): U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA). (Document No. 008390). Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://archive.epa.gov/pesticides/chemicalsearch/chemical/foia/web/html/103601.html"].

US EPA. 1991c. Peer review on glyphosate [Memo]. Washington (DC): U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), Office of Pesticides, and Toxic Substances. Cited In: IARC 2015 [As: EPA 1991c].

US EPA. 1993. Reregistration Eligibility Decision (RED): glyphosate. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances. (EPA 738-R-93-014). Washington (DC): Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://www3.epa.gov/pesticides/chem_search/reg_actions/reregistration/red_PC-417300_1-Sep-93.pdf"].

US EPA. 2009. Exposure factors handbook: review draft. Washington (DC): U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), Office of Research and Development, National Center for Environmental Assessment. (No. EPA/600/R-09/052A), 1265 p. Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=209866"] [Archived].

US EPA. 2012. Glyphosate. section 3 registration concerning the application of glyphosate to carrots, sweet potato, teff, oilseeds (crop group (CG) 20) and to update the CG definitions for bulb vegetable (CG 3-07), fruiting vegetable (CG 8- 10), citrus fruit (CG 10- 10), porne fruit (CG 11-10), berry (CG 13-07), human health risk assessment. Washington (DC): U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention. (Decision No.: 459870), 28 p.

US EPA. 2013. Glyphosate pesticide tolerances; Final rule (40 CFR Part 180) [EPA–HQ–OPP–2012–0132; FRL–9384–3]. Fed Regist (US). 78:25396-25401. Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://www.regulations.gov/" \l "%21documentDetail;D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0132-0009"].

US FDA. 2006. Guidance for industry and review staff: recommended approaches to integration of genetic toxicology study results. Rockville (MD): U.S. Food and Drug Administration (U.S. FDA), Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER). Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/.../Guidances/ucm079257.pdf"].

USGS. 2015. NAWQA Database. Reston (VA): United States Geological Survey (USGS). Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://cida.usgs.gov/nawqa_public/apex/f?p=136:1:0"], Accessed September 2 2015.

WHO. 1994. Glyphosate. Geneva: World Health Organization (WHO) / International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS) / United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). (Environmental Health Criteria, no 125). Available from: [HYPERLINK "http://www.inchem.org/documents/ehc/ehc/ehc159.htm"].

Williams GM. 1980. Classification of genotoxic and epigenetic hepatocarcinogens using liver culture assays. Ann NY Acad Sci. 349:273-282.

Williams GM, Iatropoulos MJ. 2002. Alteration of liver cell function and proliferation: differentiation between adaptation and toxicity. Toxicol Pathol. 30:41-53.

Williams GM, Kroes R, Munro IC. 2000. Safety evaluation and risk assessment of the herbicide roundup and its active ingredient, glyphosate, for humans. Regul Toxicol Pharmacol. 31:117-165.

Woodside FC, III, Davis AG. 2013. The Bradford Hill criteria: the forgotten predicate. Thomas Jefferson Law Rev. 35:103-125.

Tables

Table 1. Tumor Incidence/number of animals examined (mg/kg bw/day)*

	Males				Females			
	0	100	300	1000	0	100	300	1000
Haemangiosacromas	0/50	0/50	0/50	4/50 (8%)	0/50	2/50 (4%)	0/50	1/50 (2%)

* Taken from Greim et al. 2015

Table 2. Sprague-Dawley male rats, hepatocellular tumor rates+ and Cochran-Armitage trend and Fisher's Exact tests results (p values).

	Dose (ppm)			
Tumors	0	2000	8000	20 000
Carcinomas	3/34	2/45	1/49	2/48†
(%)	(7)	(4)	(2)	(4)
p	0.324	0.489	0.269	0.458
Adenomas	2/44	2/45	3/49	7/48‡
(%)	(5)	(4)	(6)	(15)
p	0.016*	0.683	0.551	0.101
Adenoma+Carcinoma	5/44	4/45	4/49	9/48
(%)	(11)	(9)	(8)	(19)
p	0.073	0.486	0.431	0.245
Hyperplasia only	0/44	0/45	1/49¶	0/48
(%)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(0)
p	0.462	1.000	0.527	1.000

source: US EPA (1991a,b)
* Number of tumor-bearing animals/number of animals examined, excluding those that died or were sacrificed before week 55
† First carcinoma observed at week 85 at 20 000 ppm
‡ First adenoma observed at week 88 at 20 000 ppm
¶ First hyperplasia observed at week 89 at 8000 ppm
Note: Significance of trend denoted at Control. Significance of pair-wise comparison with control denoted at Dose level. If then $p < 0.05$.

[PAGE * MERGEFORMAT]

Table 3 Tumor Incidence/number of animals examined (mg/kg bw/day)*

	Males				Females			
	0	89	362	940	0	113	457	1183
Thyroid C cell adenoma	2/60	4/58	8/58	7/60	2/60	2/60	6/60	6/60
Thyroid C cell carcinoma	0/60	2/58	0/58	1/58	0/60	0/60	1/60	0/60

*Stout and Ruecker (1990) (all deaths reported)

Table 4. Summary of the Panel's evaluation of human, non-human mammalian and selected microbial genotoxicity studies from IARC section 4.2.1 and other published sources

Test Category	Source	Endpoint	Weight	Glyphosate (Pos/Neg)	GBFs (Pos/Neg)	AMPA (Pos/Neg)	Total (Pos/Neg)
Bacterial reverse mutation	Kier and Kirkland (2013) and Other Published Studies not Included in IARC	Gene Mutation	High	0/19	0/20	0/1	0/40
Mammalian *In Vitro*		Gene Mutation	Moderate	0/2	ND	ND	0/2
		Chromosome Aberrations	Moderate	1/5	1/0	ND	2/5
		Micronucleus	Moderate	2/0	1/0	ND	3/0
		UDS	Low	0/1	ND	0/1	0/2
		SCE	None	ND	1/0	ND	1/0
Mammalian *In Vivo*		Chromosome Aberrations	High	0/1	2/0	ND	2/1
		Micronucleus	High	0/13	0/17	0/1	0/31
		SCE	None	ND	1/0	ND	1/0
Bacterial reverse mutation	IARC Monograph 112	Gene Mutation	High	0/1	0/0	ND	0/1
Mammalian *in Vitro*		Gene Mutation	Moderate	0/1	ND	ND	0/1
		Chromosome Aberrations	Moderate	1/2	ND	1/0	2/2
		Micronucleus	Moderate	2/0	ND	1/0	3/0
		Comet/DNA breaks	Low	5/0	2/0	1/0	8/0
		UDS	Low	0/1	ND	ND	0/1
		SCE	None	3/0	2/0	ND	5/0
Mammalian *in Vivo*		Chromosome Aberrations	High	0/1	1/1	ND	1/2
		Micronucleus	High	2/1	2/3	1/0	5/4
		Comet/DNA breaks	Moderate	1/0	1/0	ND	2/0
		Dominant Lethal	High	0/1	ND	ND	0/1
Human *In Vivo*		Chromosome Aberrations	High	ND	0/1	ND	0/1
		Micronucleus	High	ND	0/3	ND	0/3
High Weight *Combined Totals (IARC results only)*				2/37 (2/4)	5/45 (3/5)	1/2 (1/0)	8/84 (6/9)

Moderate Weight *Combined Totals (IARC results only)*	7/10 (4/3)	2/0 (0/0)	2/0 (2/0)	11/10 (6/3)
Low Weight *Combined Totals (IARC results only)*	5/2 (5/1)	2/0 (2/0)	1/1 (1/0)	8/3 (8/1)

ND, No Data
1. All responses based on study critiques and conclusions of Expert Panel members.
2. Non-mammalian responses from IARC Monograph in this table did not include 4 positive studies measuring DNA strand breaks in bacteria and 1 negative Rec assay in bacteria from Monograph Table 4.6.

Comment [jv51]: footnotes missing from table

[PAGE * MERGEFORMAT]

Table 5. Summary of studies presented in Kier and Kirkland (2013) and of other publically available studies not included in the IARC review

Test Category	Endpoint	Glyphosate (Pos/Neg)	GBFs (Pos/Neg)	AMPA (Pos/Neg)	Total (Pos/Neg)
Non-mammalian (Bacterial Reverse Mutation)	Gene Mutation	0/19	0/20	0/1	0/40
Mammalian *In Vitro*	Gene Mutation	0/2	ND	ND	0/2
	Chromosome Aberrations	1/5	1/0	ND	2/5
	Micronucleus	2/0*	1/0	ND	3/0
	UDS	0/1	ND	0/1	0/2
	SCE	ND	1/0	ND	1/0
Mammalian *In Vivo*	Chromosome Aberrations	0/1	2/0*	ND	2/1
	Micronucleus	0/13*	0/17	0/1	0/31
	SCE	ND	1/0	ND	1/0
Total		3/41	6/37	0/3	9/81

*, inconclusive studies not included in count; ND, Not Done

Table 6. Comparison of test response profiles from glyphosate, GBFs and AMPA to the profile characteristics of confirmed genotoxic carcinogens

Characteristic	Carcinogens with a Proven Genotoxic Mode of Action	Glyphosate, GBFs, AMPA Study Data
Profile of Test Responses in Genetic Assays	Positive effects across multiple key predictive endpoints (i.e. gene mutation, chromosome aberrations, aneuploidy) both *in vitro* and *in vivo*.	No valid evidence for gene mutation in any test; no evidence for chromosome aberrations in humans and equivocal findings elsewhere.
Structure Activity Relationships	Positive for structural alerts associated with genetic activity	No structural alerts for glyphosate or AMPA suggesting genotoxicity
DNA binding	Agent or breakdown product are typically electrophilic and exhibit direct DNA binding	No unequivocal evidence for electrophilic properties or direct DNA binding by glyphosate or AMPA
Consistency	Test results are highly reproducible both *in vitro* and *in vivo*.	Conflicting and/or non-reproducible responses in the same test or test category both *in vitro* and *in vivo*
Response Kinetics	Responses are dose dependent over a wide range of exposure levels	Many positive responses do not show significant dose-related increases
Susceptibility to Confounding Factors (e.g. Cytotoxicity)	Responses are typically found at non-toxic exposure levels	Positive responses typically associated with evidence of overt toxicity

AMPA, aminomethylphosphonic acid; GBF, glyphosate-based formulation

Table 7. Key validity considerations in glyphosate epidemiological studies

1st Author (year)	Study Design	Outcome	Recall bias	Selection bias	Proxy respondents	Adequate control for confounding	Exposure-response & trend test
De Roos et al. (2005)	Cohort	NHL, MM	No	Unlikely	No	Yes	Yes, yes
McDuffie et al. (2001)	Case control	NHL	Likely	Likely	21% cases 15% controls	No	Yes, no trend test
Hardell et al. (2002)	Case control	NHL, HCL	Likely	Unlikely	43% NHL cases and controls, 0% for HCL	No	No
De Roos et al. (2005)	Case control	NHL	Likely	Likely	31% for cases; 40% for controls	Yes	No
Eriksson et al. (2008)	Case control	NHL	Likely	Unlikely	No	No	Yes, no trend test
Orsi et al. (2009)	Case control	NHL, MM	Likely	Likely	No	No	No
Cocco et al. 2013	Case control	NHL	Likely	Likely	No	No	No
Brown et al. (1993)	Case control	MM	Likely	Unlikely	42% for cases; 30% for controls	No	No
Kachuri et al. (2013)	Case control	MM	Likely	Likely	Excluded in analysis	No	Yes, no trend test

NHL, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma; MM, multiple myeloma

EXHIBIT I

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	Case No. 16-md-02741-VC MDL No. 2741
This document relates to: ALL ACTIONS	

EXPERT WITNESS REPORT

of

Warren G. Foster, Ph.D., FCAHS
Professor
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

181. Wester, R. et al., *In Vitro Percutaneous Absorption of Model Compounds Glyphosate and Malathion from Cotton Fabric into and through Human Skin*, 34 Food and Chemical Toxicology 731 (1996).

182. Williams, G. et al., *A review of the carcinogenic potential of glyphosate by four independent expert panels and comparison to the IARC assessment*, 43 Critical Revs. Toxicology 3 (2016).

183. Williams, G. et al., *Glyphosate rodent carcinogenicity bioassay expert panel review*, 46 Critical Reviews in Toxicology 44 (2016).

184. Williams, G. et al., *Safety Evaluation and Risk Assessment of the Herbicide Roundup and Its Active Ingredient, Glyphosate, for Humans*, 31 Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology 117 (2000).

185. Wood, E. et al., *Observations on the Development of Spontaneous Neoplasms in Male and in Female Crl: CD-1 (ICR) CR Strain Mice Following 18-Months on Control Diet* (July 24, 2008).

186. Wratten, S. et al., *MSL 0025540: Amended Report updating MSL 0023134 A Review and Discussion of Glyphosate Toxicology Test Materials* (Mar. 04, 2014).

EXHIBIT J

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	Case No. 16-md-02741-VC MDL No. 2741
This document relates to: ALL ACTIONS	

Glyphosate: Review and Interpretation of Key Aspects of the Scientific Literature Concerning Genotoxicity and Oxidative Stress Data

Jay I. Goodman

31 July 2017

Background

I am a Professor in the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology at Michigan State University. I hold a B.S. degree from Long Island University's College of Pharmacy in Brooklyn, New York. I obtained my Ph.D. in Pharmacology in 1969 from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. I then completed a post-doctoral fellowship in 1971 at the University of Wisconsin's McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research. I am board certified by the American Board of Toxicology and Academy of Toxicological Sciences.

After my fellowship, I joined the faculty of Michigan State University's Department of Pharmacology (renamed the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology in 1978), where I have continued to teach and conduct research on toxicology, with a focus on the mechanisms involved in carcinogenesis, for over four decades. I teach mutagenesis, carcinogenesis, toxicology in drug development, and risk/safety

2. European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)

EFSA published its "conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance glyphosate" (EFSA 2015). The report states (p. 10) that "Glyphosate did not present genotoxic potential…."

3. Joint FAO/WHO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/World Health Organization) Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR 2016)

The JMPR stated that "Glyphosate has been extensively tested for genotoxic effects using a variety of tests in a wide range of organisms. The overall weight of evidence indicates that administration of glyphosate and its formulation products at doses as high as 2000 mg/kg body weight by the oral route, the route most relevant to human dietary exposure, was not associated with genotoxic effects in an overwhelming majority of studies conducted in mammals, a model considered to be appropriate for assessing genotoxic risks to humans." (JMPR 2016).

4. European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) (ECHA 2017)

On 15 March 2017 ECHA issues a statement entitled "Glyphosate not classified as a carcinogen by ECHA" (ECHA 2017) which stated "ECHA's Committee for Risk Assessment (RAC) … concluded that the available scientific evidence did not meet the criteria to classify glyphosate as a carcinogen, as a mutagen or as toxic for reproduction."

5. Williams *et al*. (2000). Safety evaluation and risk assessment of the herbicide roundup and its active ingredient, glyphosate, for humans. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology 31: 117-165.

Williams *et al*. (2000) stated that "In view of the clear negative responses in relevant, well-validated assays conducted under accepted conditions, it is concluded

that glyphosate is neither mutagenic or clastogenic. On the basis of this evaluation, glyphosate does not pose a risk for production of heritable or somatic mutations in humans." Furthermore, the Abstract states "There was no convincing evidence for direct DNA damage *in vitro* or *in vivo*, and it was concluded that Roundup and its components do not pose a risk for the production of heritable/somatic mutations in humans."

6. Kier, L.D. and Kirkland, D.J. (2013). Review of genotoxicity studies of glyphosate and glyphosate-based formulations. Critical Reviews in Toxicology 43: 283-315.

Kier and Kirkland (2013) concluded that "Glyphosate and typical GBFs (glyphosate-based formulations) do not appear to present significant genotoxic risk under normal conditions of human or environmental exposure."

7. Brusick *et al*. (2016). Genotoxicity Expert Panel review: weight of evidence evaluation of the genotoxicity of glyphosate, glyphosate-based formulations and aminomethylphosphonic acid. Critical Reviews in Toxicology 46 (S1): 56-74.

Brusick *et al*. 2016 concluded "… glyphosate, glyphosate formulations, and AMP (aminomethylphosphonic acid) do not pose a genotoxic hazard…."

Genotoxicity Tests Performed on Aminomethylphosphonic Acid (AMPA)

Aminomethylphosphonic acid (AMPA) is a biodegradation product of glyphosate sometimes found in soil. I have reviewed the four genotoxicity studies on AMPA in mammalian cells *in vitro* or *in vivo* which were presented in IARC's Monograph on Glyphosate (IARC Monograph 112, Tables 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, 2015) plus two additional studies (Shirasu 1980; Kier and Stegeman 1993).

EXHIBIT K

European Parliament

Brussels, 24/03/2017

Dear President Juncker,

The EU approval of the world's most used herbicide active substance, glyphosate, will expire 6 months from the date the Commission receives the opinion of the Committee for Risk Assessment of the European Chemicals Agency or on 31 December 2017, whichever the earliest is.

Last week, on March 15th, the European Chemical Agency communicated that its "Committee for Risk Assessment (RAC) agrees to maintain the current harmonised classification of glyphosate as a substance causing serious eye damage and being toxic to aquatic life with long-lasting effects. RAC concluded that the available scientific evidence did not meet the criteria to classify glyphosate as a carcinogen, as a mutagen or as toxic for reproduction."

This assessment follows the one made by the European Food Safety Authority in a report issued on 12 November 2015 that concluded that glyphosate is unlikely to pose a carcinogenic hazard to humans. The report was nevertheless proposing a new safety measure to tighten the control of glyphosate residues in food.

Meanwhile in the United States, a litigation has been brought by people who claim to have developed non-Hodgkin's lymphoma as a result of exposure to glyphosate.

It was echoed in press reports that last March 13th, a U.S. District Judge ruled that documents obtained by plaintiffs could be unsealed. The court documents include internal emails from Monsanto, a member company of the Glyphosate Task Force (GTF), which is a "consortium of companies joining resources and efforts in order to renew the European glyphosate registration with a joint submission". Later on those documents were called "Monsanto Papers" by Le Monde.

According to an article in Le Monde on March 18th, the information revealed through the emails is that already in 1999 Monsanto knew about genotoxic effects of glyphosate. James Parry, a renowned genotoxicologist Monsanto had worked with, concluded that glyphosate

had potential clastogenic effects in vitro and suggested to conduct more specific studies on the potential mutagenic effects of glyphosate. The revealed emails show Monsanto regretted to have worked with Parry and intended not to pursue the suggested studies. James Parry died in 2010.

Furthermore, internal emails from the summer 2012, and referred to in an article from Huffington Post, suggest that Monsanto had ghost-written research that was later attributed to academics. The reasoning appearing in the emails at that time was that "*it unfortunately turned into such a large mess of studies reporting genetoxic effects, that the story as written stretched the limits of credibility*". A so-called "*need to re-group and redesign the approach to the manuscript*" was identified.

As Members of the European Parliament, we are deeply concerned to see that one of the published studies used in the *Renewal Assessment Report of glyphosate: Risk assessment provided by the rapporteur Member State Germany and co-rapporteur Member State Slovakia* (see Final addendum uploaded on EFSA's website on 19/11/2015) was the *Review of genotoxicity studies of Glyphosate and Glyphosate-based formulations*, Critical Reviews of Toxicology, 2013; 43(4): 283–315.ASB2014-9587.

This study was co-authored by Kier and Kirkland. Both of them are cited in the "Monsanto Papers": L. Kier is a former Monsanto expert and now toxicology consultant. The released emails show concern about the level of credibility he would bring: "*given his geography and industry alignment, other highly credible genotoxicologists coauthors from European were sought. David Kirkland was the first choice*".

An internal email dated from July 12, 2012 refers to the signature of a contract between Monsanto and David Kirkland: "*this will enable him to coauthor the genotoxicity review paper with Larry Kier, as well as engaging him on any other projects which may come up...it may be necessary to have an EU based expert in genotoxicity on hand if issues arise during the regulatory review*".

The authors concluded that "*an overwhelming preponderance of negative results in well-conducted bacterial reversion and in vivo mammalian micronucleus and chromosomal aberration assays indicates that glyphosate and its formulations were not genotoxic in these core assays*." On page 57 of the *Final addendum*, you can read that "*Taking a weight of evidence approach, it may be concluded that there is no in vivo genotoxicity and mutagenicity potential of glyphosate or its formulations to be expected under normal exposure scenarios, i.e., below toxic dose levels.*"

In the final EFSA *Peer Review Report on Glyphosate* uploaded on EFSA's website on 23/11/2015 you can read on page 1392 that during the meeting of 27 February 2015, notably based on this study, the Pesticides peer review meeting "*confirmed that the active substance glyphosate is devoid of genotoxic potential*", despite comments raised by PAN-Europe, PAN-UK and Agrar Koordination that "*genotoxic effects on the contrary are already long known and available to the reviewers*".

Contrary to EFSA and ECHA, IARC concluded in March 2015 that glyphosate is probably carcinogenic to humans. On page 45 of IARC's monograph on glyphosate, one can see that IARC did not include the study in question by Kier and Kirkland in their evaluation: *"The Working Group determined that the information in the supplement to Kier & Kirkland (2013) did not meet the criteria for data inclusion as laid out in the Preamble to the IARC Monographs, being neither "reports that have been published or accepted for publication in the openly available scientific literature" nor "data from governmental reports that are publicly available" (IARC, 2006). The review article and supplement were not considered further in the evaluation."*

In light of all the above elements and of the non-selective properties[1] of glyphosate, for the sake of credibility of EU institutions and agencies, we urge you as President of the European Commission:

1/ with regard to glyphosate, to **take any urgency measure** necessary to guarantee the immediate protection of public health - including occupational health - and of the environment, based on Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009;

2/ to **recommend ECHA and EFSA to critically revise the validity of the GTF studies used,** and take all the necessary steps to investigate the impact of the 2013 *Review of genotoxicity studies of Glyphosate and Glyphosate-based formulations* led by Kier and Kirkland on both EFSA and ECHA conclusions on the carcinogenicity of glyphosate;

3/ **not to propose any new approval of glyphosate in the EU** as long as point 2/ has not been clarified and before all the restrictions on its use as adopted in the resolution of the European Parliament in April 2016 are put in place;

4/ to **urgently grant financial and technical support to the agricultural sector** for a rapid transition towards glyphosate-free agriculture;

5/ to **propose a revision of the pesticides legislation that would ensure that the scientific evaluation of pesticides** for EU regulatory approval is based only on published peer-reviewed and independent studies, which are commissioned by competent public authorities instead of the pesticide industry;

6/ to **set up a black list of the companies which use lies** as a common policy and, similarly to article 5.3 of the UN Framework Convention on tobacco control (FCTC), to **forbid undisclosed direct contacts** of European Commission and Agencies officials with any lobbyist working with or for Monsanto.

---

[1] A recalled in the European Parliament resolution of April 2016, glyphosate is a non-selective herbicide that kills not only unwanted weeds, but all plants, as well as algae, bacteria and fungi, thereby having an unacceptable impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem; as such, glyphosate fails to comply with point (e)(iii) of Article 4(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009

7/ to **fully investigate whether Monsanto has deliberately falsified studies** on the safety of glyphosate and, should it be established, take appropriate legal action against the corporation.

Yours sincerely,

Philippe Lamberts, Co-President of the Greens/EFA group,
Guillaume Balas MEP (S&D),
Jose Inacio Faria MEP (EPP),
Stefan Eck MEP (GUE/NGL),
Piernicola Pedicini MEP (EFDD),
Bart Staes MEP (Greens/EFA),
José Bové MEP (Greens/EFA),
Martin Häusling MEP (Greens/EFA),
Benedek Jávor MEP (Greens/EFA),
Michèle Rivasi MEP (Greens/EFA),
Maria Heubuch MEP (Greens/EFA),
Molly Scott Cato MEP (Greens/EFA),
Claude Turmes MEP (Greens/EFA),
Ernest Urtasun MEP (Greens/EFA),
Florent Marcellesi MEP (Greens/EFA),
Marco Affronte MEP (Greens/EFA),
Pavel Poc MEP (S&D),
Karin Kadenbach MEP (S&D),
Maria Noichl MEP (S&D),
Nessa Childers MEP (S&D),
Gilles Pargneaux MEP (S&D),
Marc Tarabella MEP (S&D),
Nicola Caputo MEP (S&D),
Christel Schaldemose MEP (S&D),
Eric Andrieu MEP (S&D),
Isabelle Thomas MEP (S&D),
Edouard Martin MEP (S&D),
Younous Omarjee MEP (GUE/NGL),
Eleonora Evi MEP (EFDD),
Marco Zullo MEP (EFDD).