

Pritchard, Rolf

From: Pritchard, Rolf
Sent: August 19, 2008 4:31 PM
To: 'Sandra Chaytor'
Cc: Brazil, Jackie M.
Subject: RE: FYI

Sandy:

Robert advises:

I asked that question and was told that it was two different interpretations of the same slide. It seemed quite unusual to me. This is a question that Sandy may wish to take up with Reza at the meeting, or directly with Dr. Neil

Rolf

This e-mail is confidential and may be solicitor-client privileged. It is intended only for the person(s) named above. Disclosure to anyone other than the intended recipient(s) does not constitute a waiver of privilege. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the undersigned immediately by telephone at (709) 729-6024 and delete the e-mail without making a copy or printing the e-mail. Thank You.

Rolf Pritchard
Solicitor
Office of the Secretary to Cabinet on the Management of Health Issues
Office of the Task Force on Adverse Health Events
Phone - (709) 729-6024
Fax - (709) 729-5435

From: Sandra Chaytor [mailto:schaytor@cihrt.nl.ca]
Sent: August 19, 2008 3:13 PM
To: Pritchard, Rolf
Subject: RE: FYI

Thanks, Rolf for the update. Could you ask Robert please to make inquiries to clarify whether the patient with the 2 different original results were in fact 2 different interpretations of one slide or based upon interpretations of 2 slides? In other words, did the patient have 2 ER tests originally or was there just 2 different interpretations of the same test.

Regards,
Sandy

From: Pritchard, Rolf [mailto:rolfpritchard@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2008 3:08 PM
To: Bernard Coffey; Sandra Chaytor
Subject: FYI

Sandy/Bern:

Please note the following from Robert:

Today we received the ER/PR test results for the two cases at Western. Both were positive for ER/PR. One of the cases is clearly a changed result, but the other case is not so clear.

The latter case had an original ER result of "Positive 10-20%; Weakly Positive 30-40%." In other words, the original pathology report has two different interpretations of the ER test. Given that the specimen is from 1999, the 10-20 would make it originally negative, but the 30-40 would make it originally positive. Dr. Neil says that the patient was treated clinically as positive. We have consulted with NLCHI and they concur that given the dual original interpretations and given the doctor's opinion that the person was regarded as positive originally, we should regard this person as originally positive. This means that we remove the case from the list as only original negatives meet the criteria for retesting in the database. The total number of newly identified cases, therefore, is 10.

We will update the briefing note accordingly.

RT

This e-mail is confidential and may be solicitor-client privileged. It is intended only for the person(s) named above. Disclosure to anyone other than the intended recipient(s) does not constitute a waiver of privilege. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the undersigned immediately by telephone at (709) 729-6024 and delete the e-mail without making a copy or printing the e-mail. Thank You.

Rolf Pritchard
Solicitor
Office of the Secretary to Cabinet on the Management of Health Issues
Office of the Task Force on Adverse Health Events
Phone - (709) 729-6024
Fax - (709) 729-5435

"This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."