

*Lorillard*

MEMORANDUM

March 19, 1980

*Copy on each Special Inv  
① Sterling  
② Seltzer  
③ Brooke*

TO: Mr. A. J. Stevens  
FROM: A. W. Spears  
SUBJECT: 1. Sterling  
2. Seltzer  
3. Brooke

I have reviewed the above-mentioned materials and have the following comments.

1. Sterling

Although I don't understand exactly how Sterling is operating, \$30,000 for a systems analyst consultant and another \$20,000 to consultants and advisory panel seems excessive for data processing consultation. Perhaps some economies could be made in these areas of the budget.

2. Seltzer

I am familiar with the Seltzer activities and find nothing on which to comment in the material which you forwarded. I do think it would be useful to have a somewhat detailed understanding of Seltzer's and Sterling's projects for the next year.

3. Brooke

I find the information present in the article to Lancet entitled "Effect of Smoking on Fetal Growth" provocative and worth pursuing. However, I don't understand the design of the proposed study which would involve 1,000 to 1,500 cases. According to the material, the originally proposed study would amount to a cost of about \$147,000. However, the current proposition is to conduct an investigation which is called a preliminary feasibility study at a maximum cost of \$86,500. It would appear that this preliminary study would not produce any data but would indicate the difficulty and determine the validity of the proposed methods for collecting data

04225201

3. Brooke (continued)

in the future study. It would, therefore, appear that the best estimate of cost at this time is the total of these two numbers or about \$233,000.

It seems from the information forwarded that a variety of variables are to be measured which are not considered in the study published in Lancet. If this is the case, the ultimate experiment is not simply the result of expanding the Lancet study to 1,500 cases, but rather a completely new experimental design. I am confused by the fact that the variables proposed for investigation in the preliminary study appear to be far more extensive than those which were written into the proposed investigation for \$147,000. This makes me suspicious that the \$147,000 may be unrealistically low for the final experiment. I guess what I am saying is that I find it difficult to fully understand the total proposed activity and its estimated cost, in that the presentation is piecemeal and somewhat conflicting. In conclusion, I agree with the concept, but I would like to see it better organized in terms of the variables to be considered and ultimate cost.

*AW*

AWS/hsh

04225202