


# Exhibit 434

Report of Walter Stadler, M.D., FACP  
*Fancher v. United States*, 7:23-cv-00275 (E.D.N.C.)

Walter  
Stadler



Digitally signed by  
Walter Stadler  
Date: 2025.04.07  
13:58:49 -05'00'

---

Walter Stadler, M.D., FACP

April 8, 2025

## Contents

I.	Expert Background and Qualifications .....	3
II.	Basis of Opinions .....	3
III.	Summary of Opinion .....	4
IV.	Clinical Background .....	4
A.	Oncogenesis .....	4
B.	Kidney (Renal) Cancer .....	6
V.	Overview of Plaintiff Case .....	11
VI.	Opinion.....	11
VII.	Responses to Plaintiff’s Experts .....	13
A.	General Responses.....	13
B.	Specific Responses .....	14
VIII.	References .....	15

**I. Expert Background and Qualifications**

I am a genitourinary oncologist focused on care and treatment of patients with kidney, bladder, prostate, and testicular cancer. Full details of my academic and clinical qualification are detailed in my CV. Briefly, I received my MD from the Yale University School of Medicine in 1988, followed by an internship/residency at the University of Chicago affiliate Michael Reese Hospital and then a fellowship in Hematology/Oncology at the University of Chicago that I completed in 1994. I have been a faculty member at the University of Chicago for most of my career but have recently taken a position as Chief Clinical Officer for City of Hope, Chicago where I will continue my clinical role as genitourinary oncologist as well as my academic role conducting and leading genitourinary cancer clinical trials. I will also take on administrative responsibilities for clinical operations. I have held a number of additional administrative roles including Section Chief for Hematology/Oncology, Deputy Director for the University of Chicago Comprehensive Cancer Center and Associate Dean for Clinical Science Research, Clinical Trials.

I have conducted research on novel treatments and management of patients with genitourinary cancer and have authored over 250 peer-reviewed original manuscripts and over 120 reviews, chapters, and commentaries in this field (see CV, Attachment A). I have specifically contributed to the development of gemcitabine in bladder cancer, vascular endothelial growth factor receptor (VEGFR) inhibitors in renal cancer, and hormonal therapies in prostate cancer. I routinely give presentations at national and international meetings regarding these malignancies.

From a clinical perspective, I continue to consult and manage patients with these diseases for approximately 30% of my time generating greater than the 65<sup>th</sup> percentile in prorated relative value units (RVU's) for my specialty (i.e. corrected for a full-time clinician, my clinical activity is equal to or greater than 65% of American oncologists). I have been recognized as a clinical expert through Castle Connolly Top Doctors every year since 2007.

I have testified as an expert witness at trial or deposition in the past four years only in support of Sandoz and other generic companies in their effort to invalidate Sanofi cabazitaxel patents (*Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC v. Sandoz Inc.*, Civ. No. 20-804-RGA, D. Del.). My hourly rate for my work here is \$750/hr.

**II. Basis of Opinions**

My opinions are based on my extensive experience, standard guidelines from the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN), as well as generally accepted medical literature. For much of the latter, and unless referenced otherwise, I used information summarized in available textbooks including UpToDate, which is the most widely referenced source for practicing clinicians and for which I have acted as an Editor, and Holland-Frei Cancer Medicine, 10<sup>th</sup> edition, one of the major textbooks of oncology for which I also contributed a chapter. Other specific literature references are in the detailed report below and listed under References.

I have reviewed case and medical records provided by counsel including military service records, medical provider notes, and the deposition of plaintiff, his wife, his daughter, Dr. Mugharbil, Dr. Gray, and nurse Oladipo dated 1/22/24, 3/27/24, 4/4/24, 8/2/24, 8/6/24 and 8/2/24 respectively. I have also reviewed and rely upon the United States's general causation reports (Goodman Report; Shields Report, Lipscomb report), the United States's exposure report (LaKind Report), and the United States's risk assessment report (Bailey Report). Finally, I have reviewed the expert depositions of Drs. Bove and Savitz.

A complete list of the facts and data I considered are listed in Attachment B, which will be provided separately.

I reserve the right to supplement the opinions offered here as appropriate, including if new information is made available to me.

### **III. Summary of Opinion**

It is my opinion that Mr. Fancher's renal cancer is most likely idiopathic in origin and unlikely related to any Camp Lejeune exposures. Furthermore, his renal cancer has had and will likely have no impact on Mr. Fancher's survival and overall health status.

### **IV. Clinical Background**

#### **A. Oncogenesis**

Generally, cancer is a disease that arises from a series of genetic errors, also known as mutations, within normal tissue. Most normal tissue typically regenerates through division and replication of normal cells. While this almost always occurs faithfully, amongst the billions of base pairs making up the DNA of a human cell and the trillions of cells in the human body, errors do occur. While the vast majority of these genetic mutations are corrected or eliminated, occasionally a cell with such mutations persists and can then go on to develop additional genetic mutations, which leads to ongoing replication and division without appropriate controls. Additional mutations and alterations can then give the cells the ability to move (or metastasize) to other areas of the body. Notably, there are a number of biological processes, including the immune system, that can eliminate these mutated cells. The complex interplay between accumulation of mutations and failure to eliminate mutated cells is scientifically known as oncogenesis and in patients is the disease known as cancer (see for example (Hanahan and Weinberg)).

It follows that anything that increases the frequency of mutations or inhibits the corrective mechanisms increases the risk for cancer. The single most common factor is age. Errors in cell replication are rare and generally must accumulate to cause cancer in a patient and this simply takes time. Additionally, error correction mechanisms and the immune system become less robust as we grow older.

Exposure to certain environmental toxins known as carcinogens, the most relevant being exposure to tobacco smoke, can also increase the risk of cancer. Toxin exposure can increase the rate of genetic mutations and thus the risk of developing a cancer. Importantly, it is both the amount of toxin exposure (typically known as "dose") and the duration of exposure that determines both the odds of developing cancer causing mutations and the development of cancer (Hofseth, Weston, and Harris). The science of toxin exposure and subsequent risk of developing cancer is generally conducted by epidemiologists and toxicologists.

While toxin exposure can increase the risk of cancer, it is important to specify that this simply increases the odds of developing this disease; not all exposed individuals will develop cancer and most individuals with cancer will not have a known exposure history (see Goodman report for further details).

Some patients are born with, or inherit, certain genetic abnormalities that make them more likely to develop a cancer. These genetic abnormalities, known as germ-line mutations, are typically tumor suppressor genes whose deletion is mechanistically related to oncogenesis. More importantly, these

inherited predisposition syndromes make it much more likely that a mutated cell can accumulate the additional necessary mutations to become a clinical cancer. For example, patients that inherit a mutation of the Von-Hippel-Lindau (VHL) gene have up to a 45% risk of developing renal cancer in their lifetime (Binderup et al. 2022) as opposed to a 1.4% – 2.3% risk in the general American population (Siegel, Giaquinto, and Jemal 2024). Of note these predisposition syndromes are typically organ specific inasmuch as patients with these inborn errors are more susceptible to some, but not necessarily all cancers. For example, patients born with a mutation in the VHL gene are at a higher risk of developing renal cancer, hemangioblastomas, pheochromocytomas, and pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors, but not other cancers such as upper tract urothelial cancer. Patients with such predisposition syndromes often develop multiple cancers in the same organ, with a classic example once again being the multiple independent clear cell renal cancers in patients with germ-line VHL mutations.

Finally, there are multiple families with specific cancers in multiple family members, without any common environmental exposure, but in whom a germline mutation has not been discovered. Therefore, there are almost certainly undiscovered and undescribed genetic predisposition mutations or syndromes and discovery of new cancer predisposing genes is an active area of scientific research (see for example (Roberts et al. 2016).

Chronic infection or inflammation has also been consistently linked to a number of different cancers. The scientific explanation for this is a bit more obscure, but two explanations have been offered (Zhao et al. 2021). First, the immune system produces a number of molecules designed to kill invading organisms and these substances can damage or mutate normal cells as well. As with toxin exposure the duration of the inflammation is critical. Second, the presence of chronic inflammation within a tissue or organ paradoxically leads to an immunosuppressive microenvironment, or in other words an environment in which the immune system is unable to function normally. This is critical because there is increasing evidence that the immune system is largely responsible for eliminating mutated cells that are destined to form a cancer. Thus, in a chronically inflamed tissue not only is the aforementioned rate and risk of developing cancer-causing mutations increased, the body's ability to eliminate such cells is compromised.

The above discussion emphasizes that development of cancer in any one individual is a random event that can occur in anyone. Certain clinical conditions or exposures can increase the odds of this random event (i.e. "cancer") occurring, but no one individual is absolutely protected or predestined to develop a cancer. Additionally, the increased odds for developing a cancer from any one condition can be low, modest or very high. Importantly, the difference between increased odds and absolute risk must be recognized. For example, if the odds of developing a specific cancer are 1/1000, even a doubling of risk means that the odds now are 2/1000 (see also Goodman report). Further, the studies determining these risks generally apply to a population and do not necessarily reflect the increased risk in an individual patient, and more importantly do not necessarily reflect whether that factor (like a toxic exposure) is causative in that specific patient.

Finally, given these issues it must be recognized that the exact etiology, or even the most likely etiology, of any specific cancer in any one individual can be difficult or impossible to ascertain. As a result, the cause for the vast majority of cancers is idiopathic (i.e. unknown).

**B. Kidney (Renal) Cancer**

Kidney cancer is generally described as a single entity in broad epidemiologic studies (e.g. (Siegel, Giaquinto, and Jemal 2024)); however, it is critical to note that this broad description represents a variety of distinct malignancies composed of multiple histologic subtypes arising from the kidney. The diagnosis of a cancer is typically based on the appearance of the tissue (from a biopsy or surgical specimen) under the microscope as assessed by an expert pathologist. Different cancers have different appearances, but these differences may be quite subtle. More recently, specialized staining and molecular analyses has clarified that cancers that were once thought to be a single entity, or disease, are really composed of multiple separate and distinct cancers, each with its own causative factors, prognosis, and treatment.

The most common cancers arising in the kidney are upper tract urothelial cancer (UTUC) and renal carcinoma (also known as renal cell cancer). The latter is further subdivided into over 20 distinct histologies (Gansler et al. 2018; Moch et al. 2022). The most common renal carcinoma subtype, comprising approximately 70% of all renal cancers, is clear cell (or conventional) renal carcinoma (Gansler et al. 2018). The next most common is papillary renal cancer comprising 10-15% of renal cancers, which traditionally was subdivided into “Type I” and “Type II”, but more recent studies demonstrate that this subclassification masks an even greater number of molecular defined cancers (Moch et al. 2022). More rare renal cancer subtypes typically comprising <5% of cases include chromophobe, collecting duct, and medullary renal cancers. Some subtypes, such as clear cell papillary, have only recently been recognized and described.

There are approximately 82,000 new cases of renal cancer in the United States annually, occurring typically in the sixth to eighth decade of life with a median age of 65 (NCI 2024). Based on this SEER data, the incidence of renal cancer in men <50 is 5.5/100,000/year and 90.4/100,000/year in men 65 and older. It is approximately two times more common in men than in women. Overall, the lifetime risk for developing kidney cancer in men is about 1 in 43 (2.3%) and for women is about 1 in 73 (1.4%) (Siegel, Giaquinto, and Jemal 2024). The incidence of renal cancer has been increasing. The etiology for this increased incidence rate is unknown but may be partially explained by increased detection of small asymptomatic cancers.

Established etiologic factors for renal cancer that I have considered are (1) obesity; (2) smoking; (3) hypertension; (4) chronic kidney disease; (5) diabetes; (6) occupational exposures to cadmium, asbestos, petroleum byproducts, and trichloroethylene; and (7) heavy use of over the counter analgesics [See also (Scelo and Larose 2018) and Goodman report]. Other recognized risk factors that I have considered based on the above description of oncogenesis are (8) genetic predisposition syndromes; and (9) chronic infection and inflammation.

- 1) Obesity. The relative risk of developing renal cancer for obese individuals is reported as 1.97 (CI: 1.56 – 2.50), with risk increasing with body mass index (BMI) (Adams et al. 2008). Other studies report relative risks from 1.2 to 3.0. High BMI has been estimated to be responsible for 29% of all incident renal cancers (Safiri et al. 2020).

- 2) Smoking is an established risk factor, for which the relative risk in current smokers and former smokers are 1.36 (1.19–1.56), and 1.16 (1.08–1.25), respectively (Cumberbatch et al. 2016; Tsivian et al. 2011).
- 3) Hypertension is an established risk factor with a relative risk of 1.67 (CI: 1.46 – 1.90) (Hidayat et al. 2017)
- 4) Chronic kidney disease is a risk factor, especially in patients with end-stage kidney disease and those that develop cystic disease as a complication of long term dialysis (El-Zaatari and Truong 2022; Truong et al. 1995). Some studies suggest that less severe chronic kidney disease may also be associated with a slight increased risk of renal cancer with a relative risk of 1.81 (CI: 1.51 – 2.17) for patients with grade 3b renal dysfunction (see below for definitions) (Lowrance et al. 2014).
- 5) Diabetes is associated with development of renal cancer but has been difficult to disentangle from typically concomitant obesity and hypertension. Nevertheless, some studies do suggest an independent contribution with a relative risk of 1.12 (CI: 0.99 – 1.27) to 1.29 (CI: 1.05 – 1.58) (Larsson and Wolk 2011).
- 6) Occupational exposures to cadmium, asbestos, petroleum byproducts, and trichloroethylene has been associated with renal cancer. Studies of occupational exposure oftentimes do not distinguish between specific chemical exposures making it more difficult to assign causation (Mandel et al. 1995). The specific chemical most strongly associated with renal cancer is trichloroethylene used as a metal cleanser and degreaser, which confers a relative risk of 1-2, but only in occupational settings with high cumulative exposures [See Goodman report for further details].
- 7) Heavy use of over the counter analgesics have also been associated with development of renal cancer, but the associations have been inconsistent across different studies implicating or not implicating acetaminophen for example (Cho et al. 2011; Karami et al. 2016). Additionally, statistically significant associations have generally been reported with more than 10 years of regular (more than 7 tablets weekly) use (Cho et al. 2011). Phenacetin, the agent with the strongest epidemiological data (Antoni et al. 2014), is specifically associated with upper tract urothelial cancer (UTUC) and has generally not been available in the United States.
- 8) Genetic predisposition syndromes for renal cancer have been identified, but most of these are rare with Von-Hippel-Lindau disease (VHL), occurring in approximately 1/27,000 – 1/43,000 live births, being most common and the one associated with clear cell renal cancer (Binderup et al. 2022). As noted above, patients with genetic predisposition syndromes often develop multiple independent cancers in the kidney, which is extremely rare in renal cancers not due to a genetic predisposition syndrome.
- 9) Chronic infection and inflammation is considered a common etiologic factor in many cancers. Inflammatory conditions associated with renal cancer include chronic hepatitis C,

with a relative risk of 1.77 (CI: 1.05 – 2.98) (Gordon et al. 2010), and a history of kidney stones, which are often associated with infection, with a relative risk of 1.41 (CI: 1.11 – 1.80) for renal cancer only in men and a relative risk of 2.14 (CI: 1.35 – 3.40) for urothelial cancer across both sexes (Cheungpasitporn et al. 2015).

Despite multiple potential etiologies, the major factors are obesity for which the population attributable risk in North America is approximately 29% and smoking for which the attributable risk is approximately 18% (in other words the fraction of renal cancer patients for whom obesity and smoking is a contributing risk factor for their renal cancer), with the population attributable risk for all other factors, including environmental toxin exposure, being negligible (Safiri et al. 2020). Notably many patients have multiple risk factors such as smoking, obesity, diabetes, and hypertension, since these factors tend to occur together, making assignation of causation for any one factor impossible in such cases. Finally, and as discussed above for cancer in general, risk factors increase the odds of developing a cancer, but it is not possible to distinguish the causative roles, if any, of specific risk factors in an individual patient. As such, the cause or etiology for most patient's specific cancer is unknown ("idiopathic" in medical parlance).

Historically, the most common presenting symptoms for renal cancer are gross hematuria i.e. visible blood in the urine, an abdominal mass noted by the patient or their physician, pain, and weight loss. The latter three are typically the result of locally advanced or metastatic disease and an increasing number of renal cancers are diagnosed incidentally during imaging for an unrelated cause (i.e. detection of a renal mass on a radiologic procedure performed for other indications). This in turn likely explains at least some of the increased population incidence of renal cancer noted above.

Notably, there is a long list of possible causes for gross hematuria, including kidney stones, glomerulonephritis (a specific class of non-malignant kidney diseases), infection, and exercise induced hematuria such that the majority of individuals with hematuria do not have a urinary tract malignancy.

Treatment of localized renal cancer typically involves radical nephrectomy or partial nephrectomy in which only the cancer is removed sparing normal kidney tissue. A radical nephrectomy involves complete removal of the kidney and occasionally the adjacent adrenal gland and some lymph nodes. An issue with complete removal of the kidney is that there is some decrement in renal function, which can have its own health impacts, especially in patients with pre-existing renal disease (see below). As such, partial nephrectomy in which only the cancerous tumor is removed, sparing normal renal tissue, has been increasingly utilized. The choice of radical versus partial nephrectomy is generally based on the size and location of the cancer within the kidney, as well as baseline renal function and experience of the surgeon.

Traditionally, partial or radical nephrectomy have been performed utilizing large abdominal incisions with techniques termed as "open." While this approach is still required for technically more complex resections, the vast majority of nephrectomies are currently performed using a typically robotic, laparoscopic approach. The lack of a large incision makes surgical recovery more rapid and decreases the risk of some complications such as abdominal wall hernias (Zhou and Carlson 2018). Occasionally, ablative techniques using radiofrequency, ultrasound, or freezing are also utilized, especially in patients in whom surgery is considered too risky. The exact technical approach to treatment of the primary renal

cancer is based on surgical experience, body habitus (the shape and size of a person's body) and tumor location and in general has limited to no impact on long term cancer outcome.

Following nephrectomy or partial nephrectomy, additional adjuvant systemic therapy to prevent recurrence (including chemotherapy and immunotherapy) has not been utilized; although, some more recent studies suggest that there may be some value to adjuvant immunotherapy (Choueiri et al. 2024). Recommended standard follow up and monitoring of renal cancer following nephrectomy or partial nephrectomy is CT scans of the chest, abdomen and pelvis every 6 months for 3 years followed by annual scans up to 5 - 6 years post-surgery. Although renal cancer can occasionally recur beyond 5 and even beyond 10 years, routine scanning beyond 5 or 6 years is generally not recommended.

Prognosis and survival of localized renal cancer is highly dependent on stage and renal cancer subtype. Staging is based on both extent and size of the tumor within the kidney, presence of spread to lymph nodes, and presence of metastatic disease (TNM system).

<b>Primary tumor (T)</b>	
<b>T category</b>	<b>T criteria</b>
TX	Primary tumor cannot be assessed
T0	No evidence of primary tumor
T1	Tumor ≤7 cm in greatest dimension, limited to the kidney
T1a	Tumor ≤4 cm in greatest dimension, limited to the kidney
T1b	Tumor >4 cm but ≤7 cm in greatest dimension, limited to the kidney
T2	Tumor >7 cm in greatest dimension, limited to the kidney
T2a	Tumor >7 cm but ≤10 cm in greatest dimension, limited to the kidney
T2b	Tumor >10 cm, limited to the kidney
T3	Tumorextendsintomajorveinsorperinephritissues,butnot intothe ipsilateraladrenalglandandnotbeyondGerota's fascia
T3a	Tumorextendsintothe renalveinoritssegmentalbranches,orinvades the pelvicalycealsystem,orinvadesperirenaland/orrenalsinusfatbutnot beyond Gerota's fascia
T3b	Tumor extends into the vena cava below the diaphragm
T3c	Tumorextendsintothevenacavaabovethediaphragmorinvadesthewall of the venacava
T4	Tumor invades beyond Gerota's fascia (including contiguous extension into the ipsilateral adrenal gland)
<b>Regional lymph nodes (N)</b>	
<b>N category</b>	<b>N criteria</b>
NX	Regional lymph nodes cannot be assessed
N0	No regional lymph node metastasis
N1	Metastasis in regional lymph node(s)
<b>Distant metastasis (M)</b>	
<b>M category</b>	<b>M criteria</b>
M0	No distant metastasis
M1	Distant metastasis
<b>Prognostic stage groups</b>	

When T is...	And N is...	And M is...	Then the stage group is...
T1	N0	M0	I
T1	N1	M0	III
T2	N0	M0	II
T2	N1	M0	III
T3	NX, N0	M0	III
T3	N1	M0	III
T4	Any N	M0	IV
Any T	Any N	M1	IV

*Adapted from the AJCC Cancer Staging Manual, Eighth Edition (2017) published by Springer International Publishing. Corrected at 4th printing, 2018.*

The five-year cancer-specific survival rates for patients with clear cell renal cancer stage I, II, and III disease are >90%, 75%, and 60-70% respectively. Specific factors associated with recurrence and worse survival include renal pelvis and vena cava involvement and lymph node positivity, which are incorporated into the staging system. Clear cell renal cancers are also graded according to the Fuhrman/ISUP system, which is based on the appearance of the cancer under the microscope. High grade disease is also associated with a higher risk of recurrence. Risk of recurrence beyond 10 years for clear cell renal cancers is 6%, with the major risk factor being lymph node positivity, for which there is a 6-fold higher risk of such a late recurrence (Miyao et al. 2011). Recurrence 20 years after nephrectomy are reported but are rare.

Prognosis and outcome of renal cancers that are not clear-cell are generally similar to clear cell renal cancer, but can be markedly different for specific subtypes. For example, medullary renal cancers are extremely aggressive with the majority of patients developing metastases and dying from their disease within 2 years (Ezekian et al. 2017), whereas chromophobe renal cancers metastasize only very rarely (Volpe et al. 2012). Data for rare subtypes, and especially for subtypes that have only been described more recently, is often incomplete and typically not included in descriptions of general renal cancer outcomes based on TNM staging.

A major potential long-term complication of nephrectomy is decreased renal function. Renal dysfunction, or chronic kidney disease (CKD), is generally graded by the estimated glomerular filtration rate (GFR), which is based on serum creatinine levels:

- G1 =  $\geq 90$  ml/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (normal)
- G2 = 60-89 ml/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (mildly decreased)
- G3a = 45-59 ml/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (mildly to moderately decreased)
- G3b = 30-44 ml/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (moderately to severely decreased)
- G4 = 15-29 ml/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (severely decreased)
- G5 = <15 ml/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (kidney failure)

The implications and outcomes for patients with CKD include hypertension, fluid retention, electrolyte imbalances and in the worst case scenario need for dialysis. Overall, and depending on the patient's age, the relative risk for all-cause mortality among patients with isolated G3a CKD is 1.2 (CI: 1.0 – 1.5) – 1.9 (CI: 1.4 – 2.5), with a specific relative risk of cardiovascular mortality of 1.3 (CI: 0.6 – 3.2) – 1.4 (CI: 1.2 – 1.8), and risk of developing the need for dialysis of 3.1 (CI: 1.1 – 8.3) – 3.4 (CI: 1.6 – 7.2), which for the former reflects an increased risk from 48/10,000 to 65/10,000 and the latter reflects an increased risk from 5.7/10,000 to approximately 18.6/10,000 (Levey et al. 2011).

Notwithstanding the aforementioned, the most common causes for CKD are hypertension, diabetes, hypercholesterolemia and smoking. Chronic non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug use, with medications such as ibuprofen, may also increase the risk of chronic renal disease. However, in patients with modest renal dysfunction, it is only high dose use, on the order of 3.5 or more 200mg ibuprofen pills daily (i.e. 700 mg or more), that is significantly associated worsening renal function (Gooch et al. 2007).

## **V. Overview of Plaintiff Case**

Mr. Fancher was born on [REDACTED]/58 and was stationed at Camp Lejeune from 10/79-5/80 and 11/80-6/81 (see LaKind report). Details of clinical presentation are not clear from the provided records, but on 12/2/97 he was found to have a large renal mass on imaging and underwent a right nephrectomy on 12/12/97. Pathology revealed a 9.5 x 7 x 7 cm clear cell cancer with invasion of the capsule, but no invasion of perinephric fat or renal veins, and without evidence of lymph node involvement. Per modern staging criteria this would be considered a Stage III cancer (pT3N0M0). A CT scan on 10/11/24 revealed small renal stones in the remaining left kidney but no evidence of cancer recurrence.

Post-operatively his creatinine was normal at 1.2 mg/ml and as late as 7/26/24, his creatinine was 0.97 mg/ml. Over the years he has developed obesity, diabetes, hypertension, sleep apnea, and hyperlipidemia.

As occurs in approximately 15-20% of patients (Zhou and Carlson 2018), Mr. Fancher has developed a flank hernia at the surgical incision site.

## **VI. Opinion**

In order to assess likely and unlikely causes for any one individual's cancer I assess whether any of the known causes apply to the individual, whether that individual's cancer presentation is typical for known causes, and to what degree other potential causes need to be considered in this context. Additionally, I consider the complex multi-step and somewhat random nature of oncogenesis discussed above, as well as the increased risk attributable to and the clinical significance of any known potential causative factor. For example, a known factor, such as smoking, is likelier to be a cause if that factor is persistent and long standing. Conversely, a known factor might still be unlikely to be a cause if exposure is brief and clinically minimal.

Given the medical history and aforementioned discussion regarding renal cancer etiology, it is my opinion that Mr. Fancher's renal cancer was unlikely due to Camp LeJeune drinking water. This is based evaluation of the aforementioned etiologic factors for renal cancer.

- 1) Obesity. Mr. Fancher is obese, but records indicate that his BMI was not significantly elevated at the time of his renal cancer diagnosis. Nephrectomy is not associated with development of obesity.
- 2) Smoking. Mr. Fancher does not have a smoking history.
- 3) Hypertension. Mr. Fancher did not have hypertension at the time of his renal cancer diagnosis. While nephrectomy can be a risk factor for hypertension, this typically occurs only in patients with decreased renal function (see below).
- 4) Chronic kidney disease. Mr. Fancher did not have any known chronic kidney disease at the time of diagnosis and kidney function remained normal even after his nephrectomy.
- 5) Diabetes: Although Mr. Fancher has developed diabetes more recently, there was no evidence of diabetes at the time of diagnosis.
- 6) Occupational exposure to cadmium, asbestos, and petroleum byproducts. These etiologic factors have not been demonstrated to be relevant outside of occupational settings in which prolonged and high exposure levels have been documented. Mr. Fancher has no history of such occupational exposure. See also Goodman and Lipscomb reports regarding trichloroethylene exposure as a risk factor and LaKind and Bailey reports regarding plaintiff exposure and risk estimates.
- 7) Heavy use of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, acetaminophen and phenacetin. Mr. Fancher does not have any history of using any analgesic of more than 7 pills weekly for 10 or more years, which is the defined heavy use most consistently associated with renal cancer (Cho et al., 2011). Additionally, the most well documented cancer associated with these agents is upper tract urothelial cancer and not clear cell renal cancer.
- 8) Genetic predisposition syndromes. There is no evidence for a genetic predisposition in Mr. Fancher's case; although, no formal testing was ever conducted which is at least at this time considered to be a reasonable standard of care for relatively young patients diagnosed with cancer.
- 9) Chronic infection and inflammation. There is no evidence for any pre-diagnostic chronic kidney infection or inflammation in Mr. Fancher's case.

Importantly, as noted above, most renal cancers, even if there are predisposing factors, must be considered to be idiopathic in nature. That is simply because the vast majority of patients who have the most significant risk factors (i.e. smoking and obesity) do not develop renal cancer and even patients, like Mr. Fancher, who have no clear risk factors, develop renal cancer. It is also critical to re-emphasize that a "risk-factor" for a cancer only increases the odds of developing such a cancer and the presence of such a risk factor does not automatically mean that it is the cause of any individual's cancer, especially if the increased risk is minimal (see also Goodman report; Bailey report). Mr. Fancher's renal cancer occurred at a somewhat younger age than is typical, but diagnosis at 39 is not unprecedented and in and of itself does not lead to conclusion for a specific causation.

Additionally, Mr. Fancher has not suffered any significant long term health consequences of his renal cancer. More specifically:

- 1) Overall risk of recurrence for his stage III cancer more than 25 years after nephrectomy is close to nil and no routine monitoring is recommended. In fact a recent CT scan on 10/11/24 did not reveal any evidence for recurrence.
- 2) His post-operative renal function was normal and continues to be normal.
- 3) The biggest risks for any worsening renal function are his underlying diabetes, hypertension, and hypercholesterolemia, which are also much more significant risks for development of important medical manifestations such as cardiovascular morbidity/mortality, stroke, or peripheral vascular morbidity than the loss of a single kidney.
- 4) The aforementioned risks for worsening renal function can be mitigated through appropriate medical management of diabetes, hypertension, and hypercholesterolemia, which he is receiving.
- 5) His post-operative abdominal/flank hernia may lead to some discomfort and functional impacts; however, these are generally not considered to be medically serious, and most can be mitigated with a combination of weight loss and mechanical abdominal binders (i.e. "girdles")

As such, Mr. Fancher's renal cancer is unlikely to be related to Camp Lejeune exposures and is likely idiopathic in nature. Furthermore, its successful treatment has minimal to no impacts on his current or future health status.

## VII. Responses to Plaintiff's Experts

### A. General Responses

It is my opinion that plaintiff's experts make some fundamental errors in their causation assessment. First, plaintiff's experts refer to the Bradford-Hill criteria assessing whether an association between exposure and subsequent health event (in this case renal cancer) is likely to be causative. For example, Dr. Del Pizzo states "[t]he Bradford Hill considerations are employed here for structural analysis to determine whether this particular association with Mr. Fancher is causal, and specifically, whether that it is as likely as not that this exposure was the cause of Mr. Fancher's kidney cancer." (Del Pizzo report at 15). These criteria, however, focus on potential causation within a **population** and do not necessarily apply to causation in an **individual**. This becomes especially important when the relative risk associated with such an exposure is small and less than 2, which is acknowledged by plaintiff experts even under a worst-case scenario. In other words, within even an exposed population most of the patients with a specific cancer would have gotten that cancer even in the absence of exposure. To thus attribute any single individual's cancer to such an exposure, even if there are no other obvious known causative conditions, is not accurate.

Secondly, and relatedly, plaintiff's experts ignore the implications of the multi-step and random events for oncogenesis in general and renal cancer specifically. For example, Dr. Del Pizzo concludes that because "there is really no other known risk factor that would significantly increase the development of kidney cancer for Mr. Fancher, it is overwhelmingly likely that Mr. Fancher's kidney cancer was caused by the drinking water at Camp Lejeune." (Del Pizzo report at 13). As I have noted and plaintiff experts acknowledge, multiple genetic and other events must occur for a clinical cancer to develop and there is a certain randomness to each event and oncogenesis in general (a phenomenon known as "stochastic"). As such, clinicians like myself consider most cancers in any specific individual to be idiopathic, which is not even considered by plaintiff experts. In other words, it is far more likely than not that Mr. Fancher

would have developed his cancer even in the absence of any exposures. Plaintiff's experts not only fail to convincingly "rule out" idiopathic cause; they ignore it altogether.

Finally, plaintiff experts over-emphasize the role any toxin exposure in Camp LeJeune water may have played, despite incomplete information on true exposure, differences in opinion from exposure experts regarding level of exposure, and very small levels of increased risk, all the while minimizing the role other risk factors such as low-level smoking or mild obesity may play. For example, Dr. Weiss notes that Mr. Fancher's BMI was "in the normal or only slightly elevated range" at the time of diagnosis and concludes "this is a very low risk factor if any at all." (Weiss report at 12). Dr. Lotan similarly characterizes Mr. Fancher's obesity-related risk as "not a high concern in this case." (Lotan report at 20). As I explain above, obesity *is* a risk factor but is not likely a "cause" in Mr. Fancher's case because the degree of obesity at the time of diagnosis was minimal. Similarly, even if Mr. Fancher's exposure to Camp Lejeune water increased his risk of kidney cancer, I would not assign causality to those exposures because the vast majority of studies suggest that high levels of sustained exposure to such toxins in occupational settings is necessary, which is not the case for Mr. Fancher. I have chosen to consistently eliminate **all** low risk level risk factors with limited clinical exposure as causative and have concluded that the etiology of Mr. Fancher's renal cancer is idiopathic.

*B. Specific Responses*

I agree with plaintiff expert Dr. Lotan's opinion that Mr. Fancher was relatively young when diagnosed with renal cancer compared to the "average of the typical kidney cancer patient" (Lotan report at 20). But Dr. Lotan's opinion overemphasizes the clinical significance of Mr. Fancher's age at diagnosis because renal cancer is often seen in a wide range of age groups. Further, according to SEER data, the incidence of renal cancer in the 15-39 year old age group is 2.5/100,000/yr and the average annual percentage increase of renal cancer between 2000 -2009 in this age group was 6.9%. Clearly, younger-than-average individuals are increasingly being diagnosed with renal cancer, and this cannot be simply explained by exposure to toxins in Camp LeJeune water.

I also agree with Dr. Lotan that cancer is a multi-step process that takes multiple years. (See Lotan report at 21). But logically that does not mean any exposure Mr. Fancher experienced 15-20 years earlier, which is a typical latency period, necessarily caused his cancer. In fact, most studies suggest that prolonged, persistent, and high-level exposure rather than brief low-level exposure is most consistently associated with renal cancer.

I agree with Drs. Lotan, Del Pizzo, and Weiss that the care Mr. Fancher received was appropriate, that the cancer will not have an impact on his life expectancy and that the abdominal bulge (flank hernia) is related to the nephrectomy. As I state above these are generally not considered to be medically serious, and most can be mitigated with a combination of weight loss and mechanical abdominal binders (i.e. "girdles"). The impact on quality of life is thus minimal.

## VIII. References

- Adams, K. F., M. F. Leitzmann, D. Albanes, V. Kipnis, S. C. Moore, A. Schatzkin, and W. H. Chow. 2008. 'Body size and renal cell cancer incidence in a large US cohort study', *Am J Epidemiol*, 168: 268-77.
- Antoni, S., I. Soerjomataram, S. Moore, J. Ferlay, F. Sitas, D. P. Smith, and D. Forman. 2014. 'The ban on phenacetin is associated with changes in the incidence trends of upper-urinary tract cancers in Australia', *Aust N Z J Public Health*, 38: 455-8.
- Binderup, M. L. M., M. Smerdel, L. Borgwadt, S. S. B. Nielsen, M. G. Madsen, H. U. Moller, J. F. Kiilgaard, L. Friis-Hansen, V. Harbud, S. Cortnum, H. Owen, S. Gimsing, H. A. F. Juhl, S. Munthe, M. Geilswijk, Å. K. Rasmussen, U. Moldrup, O. Graumann, F. Donskov, H. Gronbæk, B. Stausbol-Gron, O. S. de Muckadell, U. Knigge, G. Dam, K. A. Wadt, L. Bogeskov, P. Bagi, L. Lund, K. Stochholm, L. B. Ousager, and L. Sunde. 2022. 'von Hippel-Lindau disease: Updated guideline for diagnosis and surveillance', *European Journal of Medical Genetics*, 65.
- Cheungpasitporn, W., C. Thongprayoon, O. A. O'Corragain, P. J. Edmonds, P. Ungprasert, W. Kittanamongkolchai, and S. B. Erickson. 2015. 'The risk of kidney cancer in patients with kidney stones: a systematic review and meta-analysis', *QJM*, 108: 205-12.
- Cho, E., G. Curhan, S. E. Hankinson, P. Kantoff, M. B. Atkins, M. Stampfer, and T. K. Choueiri. 2011. 'Prospective evaluation of analgesic use and risk of renal cell cancer', *Arch Intern Med*, 171: 1487-93.
- Choueiri, T. K., P. Tomczak, S. H. Park, B. Venugopal, T. Ferguson, S. N. Symeonides, J. Hajek, Y. H. Chang, J. L. Lee, N. Sarwar, N. B. Haas, H. Gurney, P. Sawrycki, M. Mahave, M. Gross-Goupil, T. Zhang, J. M. Burke, G. Doshi, B. Melichar, E. Kopyltsov, A. Alva, S. Oudard, D. Topart, H. Hammers, H. Kitamura, D. F. McDermott, A. Silva, E. Winquist, J. Cornell, A. Elfiky, J. E. Burgents, R. F. Perini, T. Powles, and Keynote- Investigators. 2024. 'Overall Survival with Adjuvant Pembrolizumab in Renal-Cell Carcinoma', *N Engl J Med*, 390: 1359-71.
- Cumberbatch, M. G., M. Rota, J. W. Catto, and C. La Vecchia. 2016. 'The Role of Tobacco Smoke in Bladder and Kidney Carcinogenesis: A Comparison of Exposures and Meta-analysis of Incidence and Mortality Risks', *Eur Urol*, 70: 458-66.
- El-Zaatari, Z. M., and L. D. Truong. 2022. 'Renal Cell Carcinoma in End-Stage Renal Disease: A Review and Update', *Biomedicines*, 10.
- Ezekian, B., B. Englum, B. F. Gilmore, U. P. Nag, J. Kim, H. J. Leraas, J. C. Routh, H. E. Rice, and E. T. Tracy. 2017. 'Renal medullary carcinoma: A national analysis of 159 patients', *Pediatr Blood Cancer*, 64.
- Gansler, T., S. Fedewa, M. B. Amin, C. C. Lin, and A. Jemal. 2018. 'Trends in reporting histological subtyping of renal cell carcinoma: association with cancer center type', *Hum Pathol*, 74: 99-108.
- Gooch, K., B. F. Culleton, B. J. Manns, J. Zhang, H. Alfonso, M. Tonelli, C. Frank, S. Klarenbach, and B. R. Hemmelgarn. 2007. 'NSAID use and progression of chronic kidney disease', *Am J Med*, 120: 280 e1-7.
- Gordon, S. C., D. Moonka, K. A. Brown, C. Rogers, M. A. Huang, N. Bhatt, and L. Lamerato. 2010. 'Risk for renal cell carcinoma in chronic hepatitis C infection', *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*, 19: 1066-73.
- Hanahan, Douglas, and Robert A. Weinberg. 'Biological Hallmarks of Cancer.' in, *Holland-Frei Cancer Medicine*.
- Hidayat, K., X. Du, S. Y. Zou, and B. M. Shi. 2017. 'Blood pressure and kidney cancer risk: meta-analysis of prospective studies', *J Hypertens*, 35: 1333-44.
- Hofseth, Lorne J., Ainsley Weston, and Curtis C. Harris. 'Chemical Carcinogenesis.' in, *Holland-Frei Cancer Medicine*.

- Karami, S., S. E. Daughtery, K. Schwartz, F. G. Davis, J. J. Ruterbusch, S. Wacholder, B. I. Graubard, S. I. Berndt, J. N. Hofmann, M. P. Purdue, L. E. Moore, and J. S. Colt. 2016. 'Analgesic use and risk of renal cell carcinoma: A case-control, cohort and meta-analytic assessment', *Int J Cancer*, 139: 584-92.
- Larsson, S. C., and A. Wolk. 2011. 'Diabetes mellitus and incidence of kidney cancer: a meta-analysis of cohort studies', *Diabetologia*, 54: 1013-8.
- Levey, A. S., P. E. de Jong, J. Coresh, M. El Nahas, B. C. Astor, K. Matsushita, R. T. Gansevoort, B. L. Kasiske, and K. U. Eckardt. 2011. 'The definition, classification, and prognosis of chronic kidney disease: a KDIGO Controversies Conference report', *Kidney Int*, 80: 17-28.
- Lowrance, W. T., J. Ordonez, N. Udaltsova, P. Russo, and A. S. Go. 2014. 'CKD and the risk of incident cancer', *J Am Soc Nephrol*, 25: 2327-34.
- Mandel, J. S., J. K. McLaughlin, B. Schlehofer, A. Mellempgaard, U. Helmert, P. Lindblad, M. McCredie, and H. O. Adami. 1995. 'International renal-cell cancer study. IV. Occupation', *Int J Cancer*, 61: 601-5.
- Miyao, N., S. Naito, S. Ozono, N. Shinohara, N. Masumori, T. Igarashi, M. Nakao, T. Tsushima, Y. Senga, S. Horie, H. O. Kanayama, N. Tokuda, M. Kobayashi, and Cancer Japanese Society of Renal. 2011. 'Late recurrence of renal cell carcinoma: retrospective and collaborative study of the Japanese Society of Renal Cancer', *Urology*, 77: 379-84.
- Moch, H., M. B. Amin, D. M. Berney, E. M. Comperat, A. J. Gill, A. Hartmann, S. Menon, M. R. Raspollini, M. A. Rubin, J. R. Srigley, P. Hoon Tan, S. K. Tickoo, T. Tsuzuki, S. Turajlic, I. Cree, and G. J. Netto. 2022. 'The 2022 World Health Organization Classification of Tumours of the Urinary System and Male Genital Organs-Part A: Renal, Penile, and Testicular Tumours', *Eur Urol*, 82: 458-68.
- NCI. 2024. Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program, Accessed 12/28/24.  
<https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/kidrp.html>.
- Roberts, N. J., A. L. Norris, G. M. Petersen, M. L. Bondy, R. Brand, S. Gallinger, R. C. Kurtz, S. H. Olson, A. K. Rustgi, A. G. Schwartz, E. Stoffel, S. Syngal, G. Zogopoulos, S. Z. Ali, J. Axilbund, K. G. Chaffee, Y. C. Chen, M. L. Cote, E. J. Childs, C. Douville, F. S. Goes, J. M. Herman, C. Iacobuzio-Donahue, M. Kramer, A. Makohon-Moore, R. W. McCombie, K. W. McMahon, N. Niknafs, J. Parla, M. Pirooznia, J. B. Potash, A. D. Rhim, A. L. Smith, Y. Wang, C. L. Wolfgang, L. D. Wood, P. P. Zandi, M. Goggins, R. Karchin, J. R. Eshleman, N. Papadopoulos, K. W. Kinzler, B. Vogelstein, R. H. Hruban, and A. P. Klein. 2016. 'Whole Genome Sequencing Defines the Genetic Heterogeneity of Familial Pancreatic Cancer', *Cancer Discov*, 6: 166-75.
- Safiri, S., A. A. Kolahi, M. A. Mansournia, A. Almasi-Hashiani, A. Ashrafi-Asgarabad, M. J. M. Sullman, D. Bettampadi, M. Qorbani, M. Moradi-Lakeh, M. Ardan, A. Mokdad, and C. Fitzmaurice. 2020. 'The burden of kidney cancer and its attributable risk factors in 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017', *Sci Rep*, 10: 13862.
- Scelo, G., and T. L. Larose. 2018. 'Epidemiology and Risk Factors for Kidney Cancer', *J Clin Oncol*, 36: JCO2018791905.
- Siegel, R. L., A. N. Giaquinto, and A. Jemal. 2024. 'Cancer statistics, 2024', *CA Cancer J Clin*, 74: 12-49.
- Truong, L. D., B. Krishnan, J. T. Cao, R. Barrios, and W. N. Suki. 1995. 'Renal neoplasm in acquired cystic kidney disease', *Am J Kidney Dis*, 26: 1-12.
- Tsivian, M., D. M. Moreira, J. R. Caso, V. Mouraviev, and T. J. Polascik. 2011. 'Cigarette smoking is associated with advanced renal cell carcinoma', *J Clin Oncol*, 29: 2027-31.
- Volpe, A., G. Novara, A. Antonelli, R. Bertini, M. Billia, G. Carmignani, S. C. Cunico, N. Longo, G. Martignoni, A. Minervini, V. Mirone, A. Simonato, C. Terrone, F. Zattoni, V. Ficarra, Surveillance, Project Treatment Update on Renal Neoplasms, and Foundation Leading Urological No-Profit Foundation for Advanced Research. 2012. 'Chromophobe renal cell carcinoma (RCC): oncological outcomes and prognostic factors in a large multicentre series', *BJU Int*, 110: 76-83.

Zhao, H., L. Wu, G. Yan, Y. Chen, M. Zhou, Y. Wu, and Y. Li. 2021. 'Inflammation and tumor progression: signaling pathways and targeted intervention', *Signal Transduct Target Ther*, 6: 263.

Zhou, D. J., and M. A. Carlson. 2018. 'Incidence, etiology, management, and outcomes of flank hernia: review of published data', *Hernia*, 22: 353-61.