



<b>Grant Number:</b>	<b>Principal Investigator:</b> David Klein/Cassiana Montagner
----------------------	--

**1 - Please, analyze the progress of the project, the results and publications resulting from it.**

(Comments, criticisms and suggestions have been helpful in improving projects.)

This has been a very productive collaboration. Dr. Montagner came to visit my lab in 2016. I then was able to travel to Brazil to visit her lab at the University of Campinas. While there, Dr. Adelia Aquino arranged for me to attend the 3<sup>rd</sup> Congress for Veterinary Medicine and Biological Sciences in Foz do Iquacu.

Subsequently, I attended another scientific conference in Brazil where Dr. Montagner and I had a poster and I also spoke on the Radon research in my lab at TTU.

Dr. Montagner will be coming here for the FAPESP and I will be traveling to North Carolina to see her where she is a visiting scientist at the University of North Carolina.

We have one co-authored publication:

Oates, R.P.; Anderson, T.; Morse, A.; Montagner, C.C.; Klein, D.M. (2017). Biophysical Viscosity: Thermodynamic Principles of Per Capita Chemical Potentials in Human Populations. ACS Omega, (6) pp 2878-2882. DOI: 10.1021/acsomega.7b00613

Prof. Montagner had her undergraduate student come to Texas Tech for an internship in July 2017. She was able to work with my senior graduate student to obtain samples which were processed and taken back to Brazil for analysis. This work is underway and will result in a second publication.

**2 – If resources have been granted for participation in scientific meetings, please review the relevance of the work presented.**

**We presented work on wastewater both in Texas and Brazil. Our publication is a comparison of those studies as well as developing a new method to determine the impact of chemicals per human population.**

**Thus far the meeting I attended in Brazil, The International Symposium of Toxicity Assessment, was very good and I met scholars from many countries that work on the same problems as the one that Dr. Montagner and I collaborate on.**

### 3- Participation in scientific or technological meetings

Does the importance of the meetings justify the expenses listed in the report?

Yes     No

Was there participation in congresses without presentation of work?

Yes     No

If so, please discuss the exceptional conditions justifying such expenditure.

### 4 – Visits to the Brazilian partner

Was the visit of appropriate duration?

Yes     No

Did the Brazilian partner dedicate enough attention for scientific discussion during the visit?

Yes     No

If not, please comment on it.

Did the outcome justify the visit?

Yes     No

If no, please comment on it?

In the case of other participants in the research proposal (professors or postdocs) who also visited the Brazilian partner. Did the outcome justify the visit?

Yes     No

If no, please comment on it?

### 5. Final Analysis

Progress Report Approved

Progress Report Approved with criticisms or suggestions that should be considered in the next scientific report

Progress Report not Approved

Final Report Approved

Final Report Not Approved

---

**INFORMATION FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF TTU**

The content of the previous items may, at TTU's discretion, be sent in full to the PI.  
If you wish to add information considered important for TTU to support your decision and should not be transcribed to the PI by its confidential nature, include them in this space.

THIS ADVISORY IS COMMITTED TO MAINTAINING THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THIS  
REVIEW

I declare that there is no circumstance characterizing a situation of potential conflict of interest or that it may be perceived as an impediment to an exempt opinion. I undertake to keep confidential all the information in this case, in particular my advisory status and the content of this report.

**Advisory Institution:**

**Name:**

**Place, date and signature:**