

From: J Gallinger <[redacted](#)>

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2008 14:15:29 -0400

To: "Shane, Barbara (NIH/NIEHS) [E]" <shane@niehs.nih.gov>

Conversation: Hasty generalization of BPA danger

Subject: Hasty generalization of BPA danger

The public reaction to this report thus far is a hasty generalization of scientific theory. The draft report provides detailed explanation that the correlations between the test rodents and untested humans are only possibilities. One should be wary in getting caught up in a very common logical fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc, Latin for "after this, therefore because of this".

The assumption is that the results of human exposure through oral ingestion would be the same as the injection of BPA into test rodent. It is important to note that Dr. Michael D. Shelby responded that "bisphenol A is subject to complete first-pass metabolism to a biologically inactive metabolite that is then rapidly eliminated in urine." The metabolic effect Metabolism is only briefly mentioned in the report and seems to be overlooked by the majority of the public in panic over this very loosely supported issue, especially when independent testing could not recreate the original test results.

It is simply an atrocity to relate the test rodent results to potential effects on humans when the method of exposure is so incredibly inconsistent. This must be further discussed by the board and more specific testing should be recommended in order to support these loosely based claims of danger to us and our children.

This draft report and the subsequent testing therein provide sufficient reason to perform continued scientifically sound research and testing in more relevant methods than injection only.

J. Gallinger