

Message

---

**From:** SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [Redacted]  
**on behalf of** SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 9/18/2012 9:52:55 PM  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: Manuscript Moving Onward

[Redacted] I have been tied up most of this afternoon and am planning to work on the environmental paragraph tomorrow.

Thanks,

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

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 18, 2012 12:05 PM  
**To:** SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [Redacted] [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: Manuscript Moving Onward

David S.

Thanks.

No need to apologize at all. Companies are just doing what they think is necessary and I appreciate your coordination efforts. We'll just keep on doing our part to keep this moving forward expeditiously.

As per [Redacted] I think we're all done with the manuscript and tables at this stage except for a possible short paragraph on environmental.

Thanks again.

Redacted

**From:** SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [Redacted]

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 18, 2012 10:57 AM

**To:** [Redacted]

**Subject:** RE: Manuscript Moving Onward

Redacted

Thank you both again for your continued energy in bringing this manuscript submission to near completion. I will work on [Redacted] request for an environmental exposures paragraph later today and circulate back to [Redacted] for his blessing.

Given this is a Glyphosate Task Force project, all individual companies must approve this version prior to submission to CRT, so now we may be in a holding pattern for a couple of weeks while the larger companies grind through their respective internal bureaucracies. For this necessary evil, I apologize.

Regards,

*David Saltmiras, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.*

Toxicology Manager

Regulatory Product Safety Center

Monsanto

ph [Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 18, 2012 9:28 AM

**To:** [Redacted] SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: Manuscript Moving Onward

[Redacted]

If there will be no addition of an environmental exposure section then I don't need to see it again. We know we will get questions from the referees. I think it is in good enough shape for submission now and we should devote the time to responding to referees comments.

Regards,

[Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 18 September 2012 15:15  
**To:** [Redacted] 'DAVID SALTMIRAS'  
**Subject:** RE: Manuscript Moving Onward

[Redacted]

Thanks very much for your time and comments.

I will defer to David S. for answers to the review process question.

As far as I know the only question for a "final" draft version for review would be whether there is any need or purpose to address environmental exposure with a very brief paragraph. If not then I can send the latest final draft versions to [Redacted] for any final review process before submission.

Thanks.

Redacted

**From:** Redacted  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 18, 2012 1:22 AM  
**To:** Redacted 'DAVID SALTMIRAS'  
**Subject:** RE: Manuscript Moving Onward

Redacted

I have found a little time whilst at EEMS to review this again and my (few) comments are attached.

Will there be many more company revisions to review before we submit?

Kind regards,

Redacted

**From:** Redacted  
**Sent:** 17 September 2012 20:21  
**To:** Redacted DAVID SALTMIRAS  
**Subject:** Manuscript Moving Onward

David and David,

I have considered comments from Syngenta received on 9/14 and references received from them received on 9/17 in the attached revised manuscript. Changes or comments on their suggestions are indicated by "comments." Don't worry--there aren't too many of these and it shouldn't take too long.

The manuscript has a paragraph in the conclusions relating human exposure to the dose levels used in genotoxicity studies. I wonder if a similar very brief paragraph would be appropriate for commenting on environmental exposures compared to the exposures used for the various aquatic and reptile studies might be appropriate. I would rely on Monsanto's or other companies expertise in environmental data for the key points/references here. I have received some comments from David S. on this but would like to know if these can be efficiently incorporated. That's just a suggestion to consider and doesn't need to delay the process any further if it's not worthy of consideration.

Assuming that these responses to Syngenta are ok with you all and depending on whether to include a brief environmental exposure commentary section assume that we will be done with the first round of comments from the companies and can issue revised manuscript and tables to the companies for another review in the next couple of days or so if that is appropriate.

If there are concerns about i.p. from any of the individual companies I can provide versions with their specific report information highlighted. I would note that it is entirely possible that changes in the manuscript or tables may be considered in response to reviewer or editor comments. I'm not sure whether one or more companies will feel it necessary to conduct another review or i.p. review for these changes also.

Thanks.

**Redacted**

16428 CR 356-8

Buena Vista, CO 81211

**Redacted**

**Redacted**

-----

This e-mail message may contain privileged and/or confidential information, and is intended to be received only by persons entitled to receive such information. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately. Please delete it and all attachments from any servers, hard drives or any other media. Other use of this e-mail by you is strictly prohibited