

## SARF098 Emails Received from SAMS

8<sup>th</sup> June 2016

Dear [REDACTED]

In my previous email Kenny and I expressed concerns regards four aspects of the Wrapper document. [REDACTED] and I had an extended discussion about the Wrapper last week and, I understand, he has sent you the final copy.

Following our discussion, [REDACTED] agreed to make some factual-type changes (particularly in relation to Section 5.8) and address some of the concerns we had regards the general tone. It should be noted, however, that we still have differences of opinion in relation, for example, to fundamental concepts regard the relationship between 'noise' and 'statistical inference' which probably reflect our different scientific backgrounds. We also remain concerned that non-acknowledgment of MERCK in the review process might reflect negatively on the Wrapper if/when this information becomes public. We also believe that the 'pathway to impact' of EMB is well proven and that our findings (SARF098 final report) should be assessed within this context in the Wrapper. In relation to the above comments, we believe that an introductory paragraph (in the Wrapper) outlining its purpose would help readers put the two documents into better perspective.

These comments are written from our perspective, we fully acknowledge the sensitivity of the subject and the challenges that may occur following publication of the SARF098 report. With this in mind, are SARF proposing a joint-press release or collaborative engagement with the media in any way? We would be happy to engage in this process.

Best regards

Tom and Kenny.

30<sup>th</sup> May 2016

Dear [REDACTED]

Kenny and I have read [REDACTED] 'SARF098 Wrapper' with considerable interest. [REDACTED] has indicated that the contents and style of the Wrapper cannot be changed at this stage. Kenny and I have some concerns about the Wrapper which we would like the SARF Board to consider when discussing this matter.

These concerns relate to:

1. Transparency - if the SARF098 report attracts media attention, then it seems likely that questions will be asked about the independence (as stated in the document-pre-ambule below) of the review process. We feel this should be pre-empted (i.e. acknowledging MERCK in the review process).
2. Lack of an opportunity to comment - Section 5.8 of the Wrapper includes considerable detail about grab sampling deficiencies (lines 304 –). These may be from [REDACTED], but Kenny and

I have not been given the opportunity to comment on these and so they stand as 'facts', and appear to seriously undermine the whole premise of the research. In actual fact, these comments do not indicate a previously unrecognised issue with the analysis so do not add to this discussion.

3. Linking correlation with causation – this issue is raised, both in our Report and by the reviewers and is core to the interpretation of the report. Contrary to the MERCK Reviewers' comments, there is both a known pathway of EMB entering the environment and concentrating on the seabed and a documented case where EMB has been found at very high concentrations, at considerable distances from the source-farm, 18 months after treatment (Loch Shuna study, available, from SEPA, under FOI). Given the above, and the fact that we found strong evidence of a correlation between EMB use and crustacean decline, we re-iterate that a very plausible explanation for the association is the use of EMB. This is not an unreasonable suggestion, as is indicated in the Wrapper 7. Conclusions (penultimate paragraph, lines 637 – 639, which appears to undermine the SARF098 report). Given the above, our concern is that the Wrapper might not be perceived as an impartial overview of the research/review process (this links to Point 1, above, and point 4 below).
4. General tone – the Wrapper's general tone is to question the SARF098 conclusions. We are not sure if this tone is based on a review of the review process or the additional reviews or [REDACTED] interpretation of the reviews or the SARF098 report. We feel the Wrapper's message is confusing and that the purpose and basis of the Wrapper should be made much clearer.

We are extremely grateful to have been given the opportunity to undertake the SARF098 (A, B, C (ongoing)) research and are very keen to see the report published and disseminated. We wish to expedite this process in any way we can, please let us know if /how we can help.

Best regards

Tom Wilding and Kenny Black.