

Steven Sundlof, D.V.M., Ph.D.
Director, Center for Veterinary Medicine
Food and Drug Administration
7519 Standish Place, HFV-12
Rockville, Maryland 20855

Dear Dr. Sundlof,

I am a veterinarian, a former Commissioned Officer in the U.S. Public Health Service and former employee of the Food and Drug Administration (CBER and CDER), currently working in Private Practice in Alexander City, Alabama. An interaction and disturbing conversation with a representative from Fort Dodge Animal Health this past week regarding ProHeart-6 has prompted me to write directly to you in confidence.

On June 16, 2005, Fort Dodge Senior Territory Manager, Glen Kimmorley, and another Fort Dodge representative (to whom I was not introduced) made a sales visit to the owner of the practice where I am employed. Mr. Kimmorley and I have interacted on a business level for several years, our last contact having been over a year ago. Before leaving the facility, Mr. Kimmorley stopped in the Treatment Room, where I was completing a procedure, to visit with me. As is my custom, I inquired about what was new with Fort Dodge. Mr. Kimmorley's response shocked me, and dealt primarily with the drug ProHeart-6. He indicated that the drug was soon to be back on the market, that it was a good drug, and that it had been taken off the market because of an individual in the Food and Drug Administration's Adverse Drug Events Section, who had aggressively pursued the withdrawal of the drug for personal financial gain. He continued on without prompting to name FDA employee "Victoria Hampshire" as the culprit, and indicated that she had had an internet website through which she was marketing and selling a competitor's heartworm preventative for personal profit. He stated that she had generated \$70,000.00 in one year from these competitor product sales. He stated that Dr. Hampshire also had some association with a rogue "anti ProHeart-6" internet site on which individuals would relate negative experiences with their own animals after an administration of ProHeart-6, and that she would take this unsubstantiated information for inclusion as adverse drug reports of ProHeart-6. He indicated that Fort Dodge Animal Health had Dr. Hampshire investigated by private detectives and that what he was telling me had all been verified. He said that once "she (Dr. Hampshire) was taken care of" the adverse drug reports being submitted for ProHeart-6 had dropped significantly and that after review and public hearings, the adverse drug events for the product were changed by the Agency from over 5,000 to less than 2,000. He mentioned that Fort Dodge had obtained enough data from their association with The Banifield to support the safety of the drug to the Food and Drug Administration and that the drug would soon be available. I had listened in silence and had heard enough more than enough of this propaganda. I changed the subject to the West Nile Virus vaccine and shortly thereafter ended our conversation.

Victoria A. Hampshire, V.M.D. has been a highly respected colleague of mine since 1988 when we met while both employed by the National Institutes of Health. Her career has been one notable for her

expansive knowledge of veterinary medicine, true professional competency, and great professional achievements. Over the seventeen years of our professional association I have collaborated and consulted with Dr. Hampshire on a variety of clinical and technical challenges and have found her knowledge and experience base to be of great value. Her personal and professional commitments to exceptional animal care, health, and welfare in the biomedical research arena have positively impacted countless research animals and numerous significant research efforts. Her integrity and ethics, to my knowledge, are impeccable. It is beyond comprehension that Dr. Hampshire's work in the Food and Drug Administration would be anything other than above reproach.

It appears that Fort Dodge Animal Health has propagated a malicious personal assault against an ethical, professional colleague for the competent performance of her duty in the Food and Drug Administration. I am appalled. If a Fort Dodge Senior Territory Manager visiting a small town in Alabama is well versed and easily relating this apparent fallacious information, I would expect that Fort Dodge representatives throughout the country have been provided this same information for dissemination to veterinary practitioners across the country, to explain away formally documented safety issues with ProHeart-6 in an effort to regain the confidence of practitioners if and when the drug is again released. The financial objective seems clear. If this unsafe drug returns to the market, it is Fort Dodge Animal Health, and not the dog owning consumer, who will benefit.

For this avaricious pharmaceutical company, with a documented unsafe drug, to engage in the private investigation of a federal employee in a regulatory agency seems criminal. For this company to perpetuate the personal and professional character assassination on a competent and ethical professional's career is reprehensible. For the Food and Drug Administration to allow this to continue to Dr. Hampshire would be unconscionable. I believe that your incorporation of this information in the Food and Drug Administration's interactions with Fort Dodge Animal Health is critical, for Fort Dodge's assault on Dr. Hampshire's ethics is also an assault on the ethics and credibility of the Food and Drug Administration as a Regulatory Agency. The Food and Drug Administration should be gratified to have the quality of character and professionalism that they have in Dr. Hampshire. The protection of this employee in the performance of her duty in the public interest seems to remain with the Agency. I, for one, respect and admire Dr. Hampshire and am grateful for my professional association with her.

To hear this information regarding another veterinarian unknown to me would have elicited inquiry into the validity of such scandalous accusation of a co-professional. To have heard it regarding a veterinarian I know and respect compelled me to inform you of this egregious Public Relations tactic by Fort Dodge Animal Health. To engage Mr. Kimmorley in defense of Dr. Hampshire would have been meaningless. To have remained silent in my outrage would be professionally negligent and out of character for me. An Agency that I believe in and trust, and a colleague I respect, are both being disparaged publicly. Neither should be tolerated. I request your attention to the seriousness of Fort Dodge's latest actions. I also request that this correspondence be shared with our colleague Commissioner Lester Crawford, D.V.M., Ph.D.

Respectfully Yours,