

From: Pat Pilgrim
To: Louise Jones; Heather Predham;
Subject: FW: Calls Received re: Deceased
Date: August-01-07 10:52:29 AM
Attachments: Overview of previously unidentified.doc

Hi Louise, I will give you a further interpretation of this “in writing” which should help you.

- Of those patients who are still living, we missed two, who were not on our list and we would not have known about them if their families had not called. These were
 - [REDACTED]
 - [REDACTED]
 - [REDACTED] *
- Of the others who are still living, only one was missed, but not by us
 - [REDACTED] – she was missed by St. Anthony. Remember we only had results on the ones in St. John’s. The other regions had their own results and we depended on them to identify their patients who needed retesting.
- Of the others who are still living, no one missed them, there was a different story for each
 - [REDACTED] – from Grand Falls. Her ER/PR was positive, so she would not have been on our list for retesting. However, for some reason, the oncologist in 2001, did not consider her positive because of weak staining and she was not given Tam.
 - [REDACTED] was tested in 1996, we retested from 1997 on . She just wants to be retested.

So, of the Living, we missed 2, St. Anthony missed 1 and the other are not missed, but different issues.

- Of the deceased, we actually missed 4 who if they did not call, we would not be retesting them with the deceased we are retesting now.
 - [REDACTED] – never on our list
 - [REDACTED] – never on our list
 - [REDACTED] – never on our list. She did not die until 2006, so she really would have been retested with the living patients if we had known about her, so she could really go into the top category
 - [REDACTED] – never on our list. She did have DCIS but when

Calls Received re: Deceased	MCP #		Status
		This lady had breast cancer in 1997. There is no record of ER/PR testing or results. The physician had to order ER/PR at that time, it was not routinely done.	This case will need to be reviewed with Dr. Laing
		2000: ER N/PR N; she was never identified	To be sent for retesting
		2000: ER N/PR N: she was never identified. However she was diagnosed with DCIS and therefore does not require retesting.	Her family have been informed that there will be no retesting
		2001: ER N/PR N: however this was on lung tissue. The pathology report is very complicated and ER/PR was done to rule out a primary breast tumor. It was later identified that she never had breast cancer. From the telephone call it is apparent the family believe she did.	This case needs to be followed up with Dr. Laing upon her return
		2000: ER 25 PR 1. She was never identified. This lady died January 2006. The pathology report in 1997 says ER/PR to follow but there are no results.	Sample sent for retesting
		1999: ER 30 PR 0. She was never identified	Sample sent for retesting
Other calls requiring follow-up			
		1998: ER N/PR N: Never retested: not on my list	Sent for retesting
		1997: ER N/PR N: Never retested: not on my list	Sent for retesting
		Tested for ER/PR in 1996; wants to be retested by IHC (Not part of ER/PR retesting)	Sent for retesting upon request by physician
		From Grand Falls. In 2001: ER 30, PR <5 (she would be considered positive and not identified for retesting) however treating oncologist "felt to be ER neg given low amount of staining" and she was not given hormones. Ms. [REDACTED] has requested retesting.	Sent for retesting
		From St. Anthony. Not previously identified.	Sent for retesting

we sent our specimens for retesting, we did include these even though Mount Sinai would not do ER/PR tests on them. So she would have been sent and was missed.

- Of the deceased, the following were not missed, but had another story
 - [REDACTED] – though diagnosed in 1997, she never had ER/PR ordered, She would not have been on any list
 - [REDACTED] – had ER/PR done on lung tissue. Did not have Breast cancer. Would not have been on our list

So, in summary, we missed 4 of the deceased and 2 of the living. The others who called in inquiring have different issues not related to our review. Heather and I will talk to you further. Pat

From: Pat Pilgrim
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2007 2:34 PM
To: Louise Jones; Oscar Howell
Subject: FW: Calls Received re: Deceased

Hi there, As discussed yesterday, sending you the list of “outstanding” issues with the ER/PR testing. The first part are calls we have received from the families of deceased and the second is from patients themselves who are still alive. You will note that not all of these are “patients we missed”, but some of them are. Some of their issues are not at all related to ER/PR. Heather has been talking to Reza since his meeting with the Deputy Minister yesterday. Based on his meeting, he has been asked to stop concentrating on the results, but to now concentrate on the notification. He (Reza) has asked to meet with Heather tomorrow to start him on concentrating on the “notification” process. Pat

From: Heather Predham
Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2007 10:43 AM
To: Pat Pilgrim
Cc: Pam Elliott; Nancy Parsons
Subject: Calls Received re: Deceased

Hi Pat,

Please see attached as follow-up to our phone call this am. If you need anything else, let me know

Heather