

Message

---

**From:** LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=██████████]  
**Sent:** 8/21/2009 5:04:45 PM  
**To:** FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=██████████]  
**CC:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=██████████]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=██████████]  
**Subject:** RE: Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript

Donna,

You are right the serum free conditions could be causing this response at 48 hours. However, they do not report 'basal' response in the paper but rather report it as percent difference from the control. I will add to the comment that the authors do not report the level of caspase activity in the controls which make it difficult to interpret the validity of the assay. Then go on to state that serum starvation after 48 hours results in.....

I thought about adding tis but didn't. I agree it is worth adding.

Bill,

I will add this and get it to you by 2:00 pm.

Steve

---

**From:** FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 21, 2009 10:42 AM  
**To:** LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000]  
**Cc:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]  
**Subject:** RE: Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript

Steve,

Regarding this..couldn't the serum free medium also be contributing this?

**Figure 5.** The effect on caspase activity after 48 h of exposure to the formulation is uninterrupted. No where in the paper do the authors show the level of cytotoxicity for the R450 formulation after 48 hours of exposure. The caspase 3/7 activity noted in this figure reflects nothing more than a measure of cytotoxicity after exposure to a supra-physiological concentration of 60 ppm R450.

Donna

---

**From:** SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 20, 2009 4:25 PM  
**To:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000]; FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]  
**Subject:** RE: Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript

Bill,

Looks great. Two very minor editorial adjustments tracked in the attached; in paragraphs 1 & 2. << File: Seralini RTP REVISED Manuscript Review (v2.1).docx >>

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

---

**From:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 20, 2009 3:58 PM  
**To:** LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]  
**Subject:** RE: Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript

OK All,

Here is what I synthesized from all your comments. If you can, please take one last look at the sections that got some modifications, namely, the "Overall Conclusions" section and the paragraph on the infamous "Figure 2" in the "Specific Comments" section. I have committed to the Editor to send this out COB tomorrow.

Thanks so much for your excellent rebuttal material.

Bill

<< File: Seralini RTP REVISED Manuscript Review (v2).docx >>

---

**From:** LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 20, 2009 1:24 PM  
**To:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]  
**Subject:** RE: Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript

Bill,

For point #3 agree that it would be better to say "appears to be identical" or what you feel comfortable with. However, it is the same data. Several of us have looked at this.

Steve

---

**From:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 20, 2009 1:21 PM  
**To:** SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000]; FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]  
**Subject:** RE: Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript  
**Importance:** High

Thanks to all of you for providing your great input.

I have three questions:

- 1) Regarding David's suggestion to question Seralini's affiliation with CRIIGEN- while we know all too well about this organization & it's goals/political views, I don't feel that we need to "go there". So I prefer not to include this unless the rest of you feel strongly. I think we have enough by questioning all these crappy aspects of the publication, we do not need to call into question his affiliations – at least not as an 'independent reviewer' – as Monsanto, the gloves come off!
- 2) David, regarding your edition - (*In this response, as in the past, this research group has ignored open scientific discourse on the issue of surfactant effects on in vitro systems. Sound peer reviewed research (such as Amouroux et al., 1998; and Levine et al., 2007) have never been addressed or appropriately referenced in any of their publications, even though the authors are fully aware of them.*) – I know we pointed out the Levine paper to them the last time, but did we point out Amouroux? How do we know they "are fully aware" of this paper?
- 3) Regarding our supposition that Figure 2 is not new info and was taken directly from previous publications (Gasiner et al, 2009; Benachour et al, 2009) – do we 100% believe/know this to be true, or should we say something like "appears to have been taken from recent publications from this group?"

---

**From:** SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 19, 2009 2:46 PM

**To:** LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000]; FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]; HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]

**Subject:** RE: Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript

Added my 2 cents worth, tracked in Word. Was I too harsh?

<< File: Seralini RTP REVISED Manuscript Reviewdrf\_sll\_das\_rev.docx >>

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

Toxicology Manager

Regulatory Product Safety Center

Monsanto

ph [REDACTED]

---

**From:** LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 18, 2009 11:57 AM

**To:** SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]; FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]; HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]

**Subject:** RE: Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript

Bill,

I have inserted several technical comments and left a place holder to insert what David prepared. I didn't want to repeat much of what was stated in the original review but re-emphasized a few key points.

Steve

<< File: Seralini RTP REVISED Manuscript Reviewdrf\_sll\_rev.docx >>

---

**From:** SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 14, 2009 10:40 AM  
**To:** FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]; HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000]  
**Subject:** RE: Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript

All,

Attached are some issues with the submission based on authoring and ethical guidelines. I have yet to dive into the technical aspects, but intend to have technical response by Tuesday. Is that OK Bill?

<< File: Seralini publication issues - David S.docx >>

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

---

**From:** FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 13, 2009 3:24 PM  
**To:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]  
**Subject:** RE: Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript

<< File: Seralini RTP REVISED Manuscript Reviewdrf.docx >>  
See my comments in italics

---

**From:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 04, 2009 4:24 PM  
**To:** FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]; LEVINE, STEVEN L [AG/1000]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000]  
**Subject:** Seralini et al - Review of Revised RTP Manuscript

All,

Attached is my draft paragraph on my pet-peeve – “CYP3A4 is specifically enhanced by R at doses 400 times less than used in agriculture (2%)”. A similar statement appears page 13, lines 308-310 (“We tested R at sub-agricultural levels...below the maximum level of residues authorized in some feed ...”).

I also put together a 1<sup>st</sup> draft “Overall Conclusions” for consideration.

<< File: Seralini RTP REVISED Manuscript Review.docx >>

