

From: Pat Pilgrim
To: Heather Predham;
Subject: Re: calls
Date: November-03-07 11:02:21 AM

Were you up all night doing this? Pat

----- Original Message -----

From: Heather Predham
 To: Louise Jones; Susan Bonnell; Pat Pilgrim; Pam Elliott; Nancy Parsons
 Sent: Sat Nov 03 08:33:42 2007
 Subject: RE: calls

Hi,

As a final update... [REDACTED] is away for the next 3 ½ weeks. I spoke to a younger sounding man at her home yesterday but I didn't leave a message. I guess it can wait until Monday if you want to proceed any differently than waiting until she returns to call her.

In regards to the list that Tracey called about yesterday am: I did review those listed as not having original ER scores. I certainly would not share any information until it was verified by Terry and/or Nash but it's really a mish mash of issues. For example:

- * One lady was always DCIS and was never included in the review as she didn't have her ER/PR done originally. She called and insisted on a retest, it was early on in the process, so she was retested but she wasn't part of the overall group
- * Another is a lady who sample was taken in 1997 and she never had IHC ER/PR done, she asked to be retested and she has been sent off with the others this summer
- * Another is a lady that was sent from Western. She was paneled but even the panel letter states that the original report could not be determined. I would think this is something Western should be asked about. NLCHI has the panel letter so obviously I'm not able to tell them anything differently.
- * There are others that the specimen was obtained in July 2005 but the ER/PR was obtained by Mount Sinai consult in August after we stopped testing. This is the original ER score.

Anyway, I'll talk to Terry about it on Monday.

Heather

People to be informed that their sample had not previously been identified but is currently being retested:

All of these women are currently on Tamoxifen or a follow-up adjuvant treatment: 9

██████████ I called her back and explained everything to her and left my number. She says she was never on Tamoxifen, but she doesn't think it will be pertinent to her as it will be 11 years after she had cancer and she has no problems.

██████████ I spoke with her. Someone called her several months back and asked her permission to send her specimen off for retesting. She has no idea who that was and hadn't heard back. She hasn't been concerned as she was on Tamoxifen and is now on Arimedex. I apologized for the miscommunication and told her that I would be in touch when her results came back. Who would have called her???

██████████ Contacted her at work. She has been on Tamoxifen.

██████████ I spoke to Mrs. ██████████ (who is 83 yrs old) According to her chart, she was on tamoxifen but she was unable to tell me this. I'm not sure how clear she understood this information, so I asked her if I could contact her doctor and speak to him. She was unable to tell me who he was, so I'll follow-up with Carbonear

██████████ This lady has passed away

██████████ This lady will be 90 in a couple of weeks, and lives alone but has been following the ER/PR situation. She was on Tamoxifen for five years and has been doing very well.

██████████ She called me back, I explained the situation to her and she has been on Tamoxifen.

These two ladies slides and blocks have not yet been received from Clarenville and Carbonear.

██████████ The numbers on record in St. John's and Clarenville have are either not in service or is incorrect. She may be deceased.

██████████ I spoke to this ladies daughter. Mrs. ██████████ is very compromised after falling and breaking her hip during an admission at St. Clare's. I explained the situation to her daughter and also that her blocks and slides are currently being obtained to be sent. I also have to follow-up on Monday to see if they can get any assistance in covering the cost of dressings etc. Her mother has needed daily dressing changes for three years. She has had no problems with her breast cancer.

People to be informed that their sample had not previously been identified but is currently being retested: 2

██████████ The phone number listed in meditech is now a company number. I have a call into Labrador to get there last known contact information. The only new information I have is the contact information for the physician she saw in 1999 in Hotel Dieu in Quebec.

██████████ She was too compromised to come to the phone. I spoke to her daughter who said that she had to have her surgery done under local

anesthetic as her mom's lungs were in such bad condition. She had been tried on tamoxifen but could not tolerate it.

██████████ We had reviewed her Carbonear chart and was unable to find any Cancer related follow-up. Pat reviewed her Cancer clinic chart this am, she was already retested and informed of the results.

People that need to be called to verify they were previously contacted and told that they were confirmed negative: 6

██████████ This is Dr. ██████████ patient and she feels that she should not be contacted. Louise suggested a quick ethical discussion on the circumstances. I'll try to do that later today.

██████████ This patient is from the Northern Peninsula area. She had cancer in 1999. She was never contacted either initially or after her results came back. Again I apologized for missing her.

██████████ This patient is away for the next 3 ½ weeks

██████████ I called her, and she said she has not been told before. I apologized. On another note, after I finished speaking she went on to talk about her mammography results, so I had to re explain everything I had told her.

██████████ This patient is deceased

██████████ Spoke to her, she had been already informed