cleanair@cleanairtas.com

From: cleanair@cleanairtas.com

Sent: Friday, 24 November 2023 16:09

To: 'Raina MacIntyre'

Cc: 'DVCR RECS Human Ethics'

Subject: RE: Bushfire study

Attachments: Prof MacIntyre24.11.2023.docx

Prof Raina MacIntyre and HumanEthics,

Please find details attached.

Kind regards,

Clive Stott

Prof MacIntyre, BREATHE Study

Dear Raina,

Thank you for your email dated today.

It is disappointing to read you are going to continue to deliberately expose those study participants wearing surgical masks to the harms of wood smoke.

You would have to be aware surgical masks provide minimal protection from wood smoke fine particulate matter or gasses.

To reinforce my own earlier findings, I have it on good authority from a scientist involved in the manufacture and sale of air monitoring equipment that surgical masks only provide 30% protection from fine particulate matter.

This leaves wearers exposed to 70% PM plus the gasses. This is on top of what 3M are saying.

How can you or the ethics committee come to the conclusions you have, knowing this? You would be aware that lung damage from wood smoke might not manifest itself for years in some people, ie long after the study has concluded. Then what happens to them? They have little protection according to the study guidelines even during the study.

You seem to want to switch this back to me that I have only just raised this matter. No, I raised it back with the proper person, not just once on 2/8/2021, but on another occasion, and never had the courtesy of a reply...



It is disturbing that you are taking years to come up with something that is already known. Surgical masks provide little to no respiratory protection from wood smoke.

I will ask again. Would you as an asthmatic, as all the other compromised participants in the trial are required to be, wear a surgical mask when exposed to the same quantities of deliberate planned burn or bushfire wood smoke?

There has to be more to this. How much money is involved to undertake this study? Please provide me with the total amount and a breakdown of its allocation. Who is benefitting from it financially to keep it going? Certainly not the surgical mask participants. It says they do not get paid.

I do not care if the study is about to end in April. One day longer for participants wearing surgical masks to be exposed to wood smoke is one day too long.

For those involved in any way with the study yes it would be disappointing to pull the pin at this late stage, however, this is not a good enough reason not to and you must when I was denied the opportunity earlier to raise strong opposition to asthmatics being deliberately exposed unnecessarily to woodsmoke in the name of science.

Of course, it is unethical to lock people up inside so that deliberate planned burning can continue. I never raised this because the thrust of my concerns was to protect those participants wearing a surgical face covering being deliberately exposed as the result of a study, to wood smoke. This is about deliberate exposure and the ethics behind that.

It is disappointing as I say to have come to this. You talk about real-world, but this study has the potential to cause life-long harm to surgical mask participants, perhaps even death.

I ask again that surgical masks be removed immediately from this BREATHE study and any other further studies, as they are known to be unsafe during wood smoke episodes.

Please respond at your convenience before the 8th of December.

Thank you.

Kind regards,

Clive M. Stott cleanair@cleanairtas.com

24th November 2023