

COLLEGIUM RAMAZZINI

Guidelines for online submission of Ramazzini Days abstracts

The Priority Topics and Planning Committee of the Collegium Ramazzini invites Fellows to submit abstracts for Ramazzini Days using the following Google Form.

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1LyohCimyrEta6KapJ2vWH34T4sdO1zrr_0REsJ_bi3g/prefill

Draft your abstract prior to uploading to the website; there are seven sections in the form. Guidance for each section is provided below:

1. Format of Presentation: Select one of the following:

- Panel Overview/Introduction
- Panel Presentation (not moderator)
- Poster
- Platform
- Poster or Platform

2. Title

Please limit title to 200 characters

3. Authors/Affiliations

- List all authors.
- Use a superscript number after each name
- For each number, provide superscript followed by the affiliation—Institution, City/State, Country

4. Presenting Author

Name of presenting author

5. Presenting Author e-mail

e-mail address preferred for communication regarding submission

6. Presenting Author Bio

Describe background in a short, up to 75 word biographical statement

7. Abstract

The 300 word abstract should include the following parts:

- Background
- Methods/Approach
- Results
- Conclusions

Example 1 (numbers below correspond to the sections described in Abstract Guidance)

1. Poster or Platform
2. A survey of health effects possibly related to environmental metals exposure in soil
3. Sandra Sanderson¹, Fredrick Angler², Elizabeth Fritz³
¹University of South Bridges, Anywhere Anycountry
²GreenSpaces NGO, Anywhere Anycountry
³GoForNewStandards NGO, Anywhere Anycountry

4. Sandra Sanderson, MD
5. SaSa@SouthBridge.edu

6. Dr. Sanderson is chair of the Department of Community Medicine at South Bridges where she has worked with residents in several areas to better understand and then remediate environmental hazards.

7. Background: For many years, metal smelting in a valley region resulted in emissions. Now shut down, residents are reclaiming land for living, recreation and growing food. No analysis of the soil had been conducted to evaluate safety of these activities.

Methods/Approach: The town was mapped into a grid system of GPS coordinates. Soil samples were collected at various depths using surface and split spoon techniques. The location of samples was recorded by coordinates. All samples were prepared according to methods approved by the State laboratory and analyzed for lead. Additional material was retained for future analyses.

Results: Each of the 3000 grids measured 100m². Due to budget constraints, samples from each grid could not be sampled; we focused on 100 grids downwind of the smelter. The following samples were collected: 89 surface trowel, 157 split spoon. Lead concentrations exceeded 4000 ppm in all samples. Concentrations decreased below 20 cm (p<0.05, split spoon samples only).

Conclusions: We have recommended that play and gardening in the grids sampled by stopped immediately. Funds are being sought for additional analyses.

Example 2 (numbers below correspond to the sections described in Abstract Guidance)

1. Poster
2. Policy considerations in adopting an exposure limit for air contaminants
3. Sandra Sanderson¹, Fredrick Angler², Elizabeth Fritz¹
¹University of South Bridges, Anywhere Anycountry
²GoForNewStandards NGO, Anywhere Anycountry

4. Fredrick Angler, PhD
5. fangler@GoForNewStandards.org

6. Since 1998 Dr. Angler has been the director of GoFor an NGO founded in Anycountry in 1990 to help establish exposure limits nationwide. Trained as a health policy analyst, he has an adjunct appointment at University of South Bridges, Department of Community Health.

7. Background: Over the last five decades, the adoption of exposure limits for physical or chemical contaminants has been debated in many countries.

Methods/Approach: In order to better understand barriers and approaches to overcoming barriers, the timelines of standard setting activities in the following countries were created: Country 1, Country 2, Country 3, Country 4, Country 5. The work was restricted to actions initiated in 1980 through 1999 in order to have opportunity to track approaches to resolving barriers.

Results: The timelines for each country will be presented. A total of XX regulations were proposed across these countries. Most (XX%) were updates/revisions of existing exposure limits. Barriers included challenges from employers, workers, trade associations. Challenges were similar for proposed new actions and revisions. For illustration, details will be provided for noise exposure actions. Most efficient (measured by time from announcement to implementation) occurred in the NameCountry. Only one level of noise exposure was implemented as proposed; all others were modified to a less stringent value based on challenges of cost or absence of a proven technology to achieve the new limit. These two factors were also important barriers in considering proposals for other physical and chemical agents.

Conclusions: Costs and technical feasibility are two barriers to new exposure limits. The results show many opportunities for research, and the essential role of information on cost and technology in reducing exposures.