Exhibit 605

	Page 1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
2	SOUTHERN DIVISION
	No. 7:23-CV-897
3	
4	IN RE:
	CAMP LEJEUNE WATER LITIGATION)
5)
6	
7	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF DAVID A. D'ALESSIO, M.D.
8	
9	PURSUANT TO NOTICE, the above-entitled deposition
10	was taken on behalf of the Plaintiffs at the law offices
11	of James Scott Farrin, 555 S. Mangum Street, Suite 800,
12	Durham, North Carolina 27701, on Wednesday, June 25,
13	2025, at 8:58 a.m., before Sophie Brock, Registered
14	Diplomate Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, and
15	Notary Public in and for the State of North Carolina.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Job No. MDLG7434034

Page 2 of 123

		Page 2
1		APPEARANCES
2	ON BEHALF	OF THE PLAINTIFFS:
3		MCGOWAN, HOOD & FELDER, LLC
		1539 Health Care Drive
4		Rock Hill, South Carolina 29732
		Telephone: (803) 327-7800
5		By: CHAD A. MCGOWAN, ESQ.
		cmcgowan@mcgowanhood.com
6		(In Person)
7		WEITZ & LUXENBERG P.C.
		Fisher Building
8		3011 West Grand Blvd., 24th Floor
		Detroit, Michigan 48202
9		Telephone: (313) 800-4170
		By: DIANA GJONAJ, ESQ.
10		dgjonaj@weitzlux.com
		(Via Zoom)
11		
		KELLER POSTMAN, LLC
12		111 Congress Avenue, Suite 500
		Austin, Texas 78701
13		Telephone: (512) 690-0990
		By: ZINA BASH, ESQ.
14		zina.bash@kellerpostman.com
		(Via Zoom)
15		
16	ON BEHALF	OF THE DEFENDANT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:
17		U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
		1100 L Street, NW
18		Room 4054
		Washington, D.C. 20005
19		Telephone: (202) 307-1024
		By: WILLIAM V. KLOTZBUCHER, ESQ.
20		william.v.klotzbucher@usdoj.gov
20		(In Person)
21		ALLISON O'LEARY, ESQ.
4 1		allison.oleary@usdoj.gov
22		(In Person)
23		(III FCISUII)
		IED.
24	VIDEOGRAPI	
25		Corey Parker

	Page 3
1	INDEX OF EXAMINATIONS
2	PAGE
3	BY MR. MCGOWAN 4
4	BY MR. KLOTZBUCHER
5	
6	REPORTER'S NOTE: There were no exhibits marked.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 4
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We
3	are now on the record. Today's date is Wednesday,
4	June 25th, 2025. The time is 8:58 a.m.
5	This is the case of the Camp Lejeune Water
6	Litigation v. The United States of America.
7	The deponent is Dr. David D'Alessio.
8	Counsel, please introduce yourselves, after
9	which our court reporter will swear in our witness.
10	MR. MCGOWAN: Chad McGowan for the
11	plaintiff.
12	MR. KLOTZBUCHER: For the defense,
13	William Klotzbucher and Allison O'Leary.
14	Whereupon,
15	DAVID A. D'ALESSIO, M.D.,
16	having first been duly sworn/affirmed,
17	was examined and testified as follows:
18	EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE PLAINTIFFS
19	BY MR. MCGOWAN:
20	Q. Good morning, Doctor. My name is Chad
21	McGowan. And your name is D'Alessio?
22	A. D'Alessio, yes.
23	Q. All right. So if I don't do that right,
24	I apologize in advance

25

Α.

It's okay.

- 1 Ο. -- but I'm going to do my best. Have you ever been deposed before? 2
 - No. Α.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So this is a chance -- I'm going to Ο. Okay. ask questions. Your job is to listen to the question and answer the question the best you can.

If you have any question about my question, it's unclear, please let me know. Otherwise it may look like we're communicating when we're really not. All right?

- Α. Mm-hmm.
- In front of you, hopefully, is a copy of your report that you made in this case?
 - Α. Yeah.
 - All right. Wonderful. Ο.

If you need a break at any time, for any reason, that is not a problem. I do not think this is going to go that long.

- Α. Okay.
- So we'll just get into it. Ο. Do you have any --
 - Α. No.
 - -- concerns, problems, questions right now? Q.
- 24 No, not at all. Α.
- 25 Q. All right. Good. Let's get rolling.

Tell me how it is that you got involved in this case.

- A. I was contacted by email. I get contacted for a lot of cases, just because I'm an endocrinologist and my name is on the website at Duke.
- Q. Okay. So you get contacted for a lot of cases, but you've never been deposed before?
 - A. Right. I don't take most cases.
 - Q. I gotcha --
- A. I mean, I just -- yeah, I don't have the time.
- Q. Understood. So what made you want to get involved in this case versus other cases?
- A. Just it -- I was thinking about that. It seemed interesting. I've worked in North Carolina for ten years. I do half my time at the veterans' hospital across the street from Duke. People talk about Camp Lejeune all the time. It's been in the newspaper. It's been in the medical journals. It just seemed interesting.
- Q. Okay. And did you first get contacted by someone from the DoJ or some kind of service?
 - A. Yeah, DoJ.
- Q. Okay. And did they share with you how they got your name?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 7 of 123

Page 7 1 Α. No. Probably the Duke website? 2 Ο. 3 Probably, yeah. Α. 4 Okay. And the -- I've noticed some of your O. bills, it's, like -- what -- \$600 an hour, \$3,500 half 5 a day kind of thing; is that right? 6 Yeah. Α. Tell me what your total billing has been so 8 9 far. I think I -- one invoice for \$3,000 and one 10 11 for \$12,000. 12 Q. And then you have time that has been accrued but unbilled? 13 14 Α. Yes. 15 And how much is that? Ο. 16 About six or seven hours. 17 All right. And does that money go to you, or Ο. 18 does that go to a practice or --19 Α. That money goes to me. 20 Okay. And half of it goes back to the Q. 21 government; right -- in taxes? 22 Yeah. Α. 23 Understood. All right, let's talk about 24 litigation history. 2.5 Have you ever acted as an expert -- have you

Page 8 of 123

written expert reports before?

A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. All right. So this is literally your first time being involved in all this?
- A. Yeah. Being involved at this level. So, in the past, I have -- somebody's -- when I was young and trying to make extra money, I would look at cases as an expert. Somebody would send me a case and say, "Is there a claim here?" or "Is there an endocrine problem here?" And I would give them a quick opinion. But it was never to the point of writing formal reports.
- Q. And never to the point of giving testimony by deposition or at trial?
 - A. Never.
 - Q. Have you ever been sued before?
 - A. No.
- Q. Tell me what you consider yourself an expert in. What field?
- A. Endocrinology.
- Q. Tell me what endocrinology is from a layperson's perspective.
 - A. Yeah. So endocrinology is, broadly, the diseases related to hormones. So what has fallen under our purview are diseases of the pituitary gland, the thyroid gland, the adrenal glands, the gonads, and

Page 9 of 123

	then	metabolic	problems	like	diabetes	or	cholesterol	
--	------	-----------	----------	------	----------	----	-------------	--

- Q. Your day-to-day patient work is with mostly diabetic patients?
- A. Well, 50 percent of the people that come to an endocrine clinic have diabetes. It's by far the most prevalent condition.

In my practice, I see allcomers, so I see a little bit of everything, but I would say my expertise is in diabetes.

- Q. What does a normal workweek, outside of this sort of situation, look like for you?
- A. So on Monday, I'm in -- I have a research lab -- we have lab meeting, and I meet with the postdoctoral fellows and the research people that day.

Tuesday morning, I do administrative work. Tuesday afternoon, I go to clinic.

Wednesday is a day that, again, I do mostly administrative work. I'm the division director.

That's -- that afternoon is when I do writing, data

Thursday, I'm in clinic.

analysis, that kind of stuff.

Friday morning, I'm in clinic. Friday afternoon, we have conferences, faculty meetings, grand rounds.

Q. How much of your time is spent teaching?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	A. So I don't teach in the classroom anymore.
2	In my two previous jobs I did a lot of classroom
3	teaching. Now I mostly teach in the clinic. So that
4	is all three of the clinic sessions I have in the
5	week, there will be an endocrine fellow so somebody
6	who's finished their residency who's training in
7	endocrinology and they'll work with me, and I'll
8	teach them there. I get students and medicine
9	residents that come work with me in the clinic as
10	well.

So I would say, you know, if I do 30 percent of my week as clinical time, probably half of that involves some teaching.

- And then the other 70 percent of your time is going to be research and administrative stuff?
 - Yeah.
- And you find that the more senior you get, the more administrative stuff there usually is?
 - Yeah. Α.
 - Okay. Q.
- Yeah. So it should be 30/30/30, and it's Α. 30/30/60 because the administrative stuff never stops.
 - Yeah, I understand.

Is endocrinology a sub-board of internal medicine?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 Α. Yes, it is.
 - Do you consider yourself a toxicologist? Ο.

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.

THE WITNESS: I don't.

BY MR. MCGOWAN: 5

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

Q. Okay. A cardiologist, oncologist, or an expert in chemotherapy?

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: No.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- Ο. All right. We've been provided an extensive list of materials considered, because that's what the rules require. Was there anything else that should have been on that list that just wasn't?
- No. We were pretty complete. And the stuff that's on that list, I looked at damn near every page, but there was nothing else.
- Q. Okay. I appreciate you not just putting "PubMed" on there.
 - Α. Yeah.
 - Narrowed it down a little. Ο.

All right. Let's talk about the timeline 23 for this particular patient. 24

> Α. Yes.

1	Q. Let's lay out sort of what we know, because
2	would you agree with me that there are gaps in the
3	medical evidence?
4	A. Yes. I think I saw that in the report, too.
5	Q. Yeah. So let's just lay out some dates that

8 Α. Mm-hmm.

okay?

6

7

9

10

11

14

15

17

2.5

So when was the first date that you believe that we can rely upon that this patient had a diagnosis of diabetes?

we know or are pretty confident that we can rely upon;

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form. 12

13 You may answer.

Again, that data is THE WITNESS: secondary. Somewhere around 2008 or '9.

16 BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- And when was the NHL diagnosis? Ο.
- 18 Α. January 1998.
- And when was the NHL treatment concluded, 19 20 let's say?
- 21 A. Active treatment, I think, was done by July '98. 22
- 23 And what was the actual treatment for the NHL that was provided to this patient? 24
 - Α. I mean, I'd have to go back through the

records,	but	it	seemed	like	а	combination	of
chemother	rapy	and	radiat	cion t	the	erapy.	

- Q. Okay. Did you put in your report what the actual treatment was?
- A. My report says they -- treated by Petersdorf Lindsley. They recommended chemotherapy, systemic radiation therapy, and stem cell transplant.
- Q. Okay. So were you -- are you aware of the actual -- the chemotherapy regimen that was used in this case?
- A. I mean, I know he had some version of CHOP before he went to Washington, and I can't remember what the drugs are in CHOP. Again, chemotherapy is not something I do a lot of.

I know he had -- that he had preparatory systemic radiation, because I know that's what you do for a stem cell transplant. And then the other thing he had was a couple of chemotherapeutics after his radiation.

Again, the details were pretty clear in the University of Washington records.

Q. Okay. So are you aware of, or an expert in, the effect of that treatment on kidney function and/or cardiac function?

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

You may answer

I know that -- so one of THE WITNESS: the drugs, Adriamycin, can cause cardiac toxicity, but I don't know a lot about the other chemotherapies and their effect on renal function -- kidney function.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- When was kidney impairment first evident for this patient?
- That was another one -- I mean, when he was referred to Dr. Leach -- and I think that was May of 2013 -- he had kidney failure, or he had chronic -what looked like chronic kidney disease, as marked by his eGFR, his creatinine.

In the hospital, he had three days where his creatinine was elevated during his chemotherapy, and I think he got infected, but that corrected before he was discharged.

And other than that, there's -- that's part of the big gap. I didn't see a lot of tracking of his renal function.

Did he have a creatinine of 1.4 in the early 2000s?

I have a note, and I'll read it to you just to save a little time --

Α. Oh, yeah here it is. (As read):

"During an outpatient visit in
April 2000, Mr. Keller was noted
to have a normal creatinine; in
July 2003, his creatinine was
noted to be 1.4."

- Is that slightly above normal? Ο.
- It depends on -- in some places, that's -- it Α. goes to 1.5. But 1.4 is upper limit of normal.
- Do you have any conclusion as to whether that would be, basically, on the upswing in a bad way latterly?

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection.

You can answer.

Form.

THE WITNESS: I mean, with a single value sitting out there -- I mean, the most common thing -- when did I say that was? July 2023. most common reason for your creatinine to be up a little bit in July is dehydration. I'm going to play golf tonight at 6:00. I think, when I get off the golf course, my creatinine will be a few points higher because of dehydration.

Could be that -- the other common thing we see, when people's creatinine goes up, is oftentimes that's a harbinger that their blood sugar has been

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

high, because when your blood sugar goes up, you tend to get dehydrated as well.

So I can't tell whether a single value like this is part of a trend or if it's, you know, one of the normal fluctuations we see in kidney function, of which there are lots of causes.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- Q. And we do have -- and it's in your report -- that in 2012, that there was a Stage 3 chronic kidney disease diagnosis?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. How does one progress to Stage 3? Is it you go through -- I assume there's a 1 and a 2?
- A. Yeah. I mean, so chronic kidney disease is defined by the eGFR, the glomerular filtration rate. This is calculated from the creatinine, which is a common blood test. And those are roughly equivalent. The eGFR includes age and body size, so it corrects for two things that can make the creatinine go.

Stage 1 is GFR less than 90; Stage 2, less than 60; and then -- so you're right, it progresses gradually -- in some cases it progresses gradually from Stage 1-2 to 3 and 3A, 3B, and 4.

Q. So do you have any reason to believe that in this case Mr. Keller's kidney disease did not progress

Page 17 1 gradually? 2 MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form. 3 You can answer. 4 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mean, again, in the absence of any information, I -- you know, any 5 clinical information, it's really hard to tell. 6 BY MR. MCGOWAN: Well, do most people --8 Ο. 9 Α. Yes ---- progress gradually? 10 Ο. 11 -- most people, it would be a gradual Α. 12 progression. 13 And is that over years? 14 Α. Yes. 15 And is there any reason to suspect that 16 Mr. Keller would not be in the majority group for that 17 metric? 18 Α. No. Okay. So is it fair to say that it's more 19 20 likely than not that Mr. Keller had a gradual 21 progression to Stage 3 chronic kidney disease that was noted as of 2012? 22 23 MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form. 24 You may answer. 2.5 THE WITNESS: Okay.

Yes. I think it's likely that he had a gradual progression.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- Q. Okay. Are you -- help explain this to me.

 If you have -- I mean, diabetes is known to cause kidney disease; is that right?
- A. It's the most common cause of kidney failure in the United States. It would be on the top of anybody's list of the causes of chronic kidney disease.
 - O. How does it do that?
- A. A lot of it's related to high blood sugar, hyperglycemia; right? Which sort of -- I'll make -- it floods the kidneys with glucose, makes them work extra hard, starts to cause damage in what is a pretty delicate network of cells; and over time, these cells start to become damaged, and you have progression.

So the steady progression of CKD has been worked up for diabetes better than most conditions.

- Q. So what I hear you saying is that, basically, the high blood sugar, and what it causes, causes a scarring of those little delicate cells and a deposition of scar tissue --
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. -- which then makes the kidney less able to

1 do its job?

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- A. Yes.
- O. Okay.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Now, is this a -- does the kidney have a certain reserve, in that it can take some amount of damage before you start having creatinine rises?
- A. There's some reserve, yeah. I mean, we know that because you can donate a kidney to somebody and one kidney left over is usually enough to compensate.
- Q. So you can have progressive kidney damage, from whatever source, that takes a while for it to be evident in lab work?
- A. Damage is a -- so when we measure creatinine clearance, or eGFR, and use that to tag the progression through chronic kidney disease, that's a functional measure; that's telling us how the kidney is functioning.

For -- in the field of nephrology, damage is something that you would see on a biopsy, on an image, or with -- attached to specific biomarkers for particular diseases. So damage and function are two different things.

We generally follow people with function because doing biopsies is invasive and painful. And

so, you know, we make a lot of assumptions. Now, the
assumptions are based on old biopsy data. But to
say you know, damage is different than chronic
kidney disease and loss of function, I think. Just
have to be clear that those are specific terms.

- Right. Well, the damage would presumably Ο. cause a function problem at some point?
- Not necessarily. I mean, we see patients all the time that they get a -- well, again, we don't have biopsies to tell. But we see people in the hospital all the time get sick, have their blood pressure fall, get a noxious drug, et cetera, and have their function impaired; and then when they come back to the clinic, their creatinine is fine; the next year, their creatinine is fine, et cetera.

So one episode of a decreased function or one episode of a challenge to the function doesn't necessarily mean that you're going to be on the road to progressive kidney failure.

I appreciate that, and I'm not doing a great Q. job, so I apologize.

The question is, can you be sustaining kidney damage initially without it reflecting in the function measures?

Like, can your kidney absorb some amount of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

injury	befor	re the	funct	cions	start	sho	owing	impaiı	red
through	the	normal	lab	work	that	you	would	make	these
diagnos	ses th	nrough?							

A. Again, that's -- you know, that's a really difficult -- I mean, that's a question that's really hard to answer because I don't think people have looked -- I mean, the reason people look for kidney damage is they see abnormal kidney function. So there's just not a lot of data on saying, you know, we should biopsy a bunch of people that got this noxious drug -- even though they didn't get kidney functional abnormalities, let's biopsy them and see if there's any damage. So there's just not a deep dataset in that regard. Right?

The reason you look for damage and do biopsies is you see abnormality in function.

O. I understand.

Tell me how it is that you ruled out any damage caused to this man's kidneys by the chemo or the treatment for the NHL. How did you rule that out, in this particular case, as contributing to the problem?

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: So "rule in," "rule out"

is a general term.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

So this guy had a transient change in his kidney function, as many cancer patients do. rebounded really quickly, and for three or four years after his treatment for stem cell transplantation, he had normal kidney function. You know, based on that, he did not -- in my view, he didn't have a lot of residual damage. Now, without a biopsy, I couldn't tell you for sure. But subsequent to that, he had lots and lots of common kidney challenges.

And so, you know, for me to speculate that there was a subclinical kidney insult during his stem cell therapy that didn't manifest past his discharge from hospital made it seem really unlikely in the face of all these other things that are listed in my report that commonly cause chronic kidney disease.

And so did I rule it out? Maybe not. it at the bottom of my differential? The absolute bottom in terms of likelihood? Yeah.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

Q. Okay. So how did you evaluate its contributing factor? Because you can have both; right? You can certainly have damage to your kidney from stem cell treatments, chemo, whatever, and damage from high blood sugar and diabetes; right? Those two

			_
can	coexi	st	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Oh, they could coexist --

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.

Excuse me, Doctor.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

Yeah, I think they can coexist. But again, he had -- we have to -- I don't know when he developed diabetes, but he had normal kidney function for the first few years after his stem cell transplant.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- Q. Well, he also had normal kidney function for the first few years after his diabetes?
- A. We don't know that. We don't know when he got diabetes. And we don't know what his kidney function was after 2003 until 2012 -- or at least I didn't see any evidence to support that.
- Q. Okay. So you did not rule out the treatment for NHL as a contributing -- potential contributing cause to that, in addition to the other things you identified; is that right?
- A. I guess that's -- I mean, I just thought it was very unlikely.
 - Q. Well, I appreciate that, but it just seems to

me	th	at	it	can	be	both	ı. Ir	mean,	tell	. me	how	it	
tel	.1	me	why	it	is	you	think	it's	not	both	ı.		

A. I quess --

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: I guess it's -- if you have two things -- or four things, and three things are well documented and high likelihood to cause kidney failure, to throw in something that's really unlikely to add to them just doesn't -- you know, I mean, I don't know -- he could have had kidney damage anytime up to his transplant, and I didn't consider that in this at all.

40 percent of people that have type 2 diabetes are going to get some kind of kidney dysfunction from it.

People that take a lot of nonsteroidals for gout and other arthritis problems have an increased risk of heart -- of kidney failure as well.

People with gout and high uric acid levels have some risk for kidney failure.

So these are all common explanatory causes for a guy that develops Stage 3 kidney disease over time; and to sort of decide how many cells you can put on the top of a pin about his chemotherapy just, you

1 know, doesn't seem that relevant to me.
2 BY MR. MCGOWAN:

Q. Well, you said it was unlikely that his chemo and the treatment for the NHL -- and I mean this with all due respect -- how do you know how unlikely it is if you don't even know what the particular treatment was and the effect of that treatment on kidney cells is?

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Again, part of it is

the -- again, he -- whether he had any damage to the

kidney with his chemotherapy, it didn't manifest as a

significant functional deficit for some time; so, you

know, for the most part, that suggests that any damage
he incurred was not very serious.

And whether I know the particulars of rates of kidney failure with whatever drugs he got sort of doesn't matter in that case. It wasn't enough to cause a measurable effect on his kidney function.

And so, therefore, to extend that to causation for his Stage 3 kidney disease is just a little bit fanciful, I think.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

Q. Okay. Well, let's get to the bottom of that.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'm talking about kidney damage, and you're talking about the measures -- the creatinine and the function -- the function of the kidney?

A. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And we have discussed that you can have damage to the kidney but preserved function?
- A. Even that's -- even that's murky. I mean, damage is, again, defined by pathology on biopsy or an abnormality on a CAT scan or an ultrasound or a particular biomarker; but almost all of those things are tied to abnormal function. That is, we just don't look for damage in people with normal kidney function. And so it's tying -- tying "damage" to function is an area where there's just not a lot of information.
- Q. Well, let's use the situation that you mentioned where you're a kidney donor, and you have two kidneys, and one of them is removed and surgically implanted in another patient.
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. Frequently, the donor, the person who has the one kidney now, has normal kidney markers, normal function; right?
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. So does that not tell us that you can at least lose a whole kidney without it affecting your

Page 27 1 lab work, your function? 2 MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form. 3 You may answer. 4 THE WITNESS: It tells you --Hang on, Doctor. 5 MR. MCGOWAN: What's wrong with the form of that question? 6 7 You've made these objections, I think, 12 or 15 times, 8 and I'm -- what's wrong with the form of the question, 9 please? 10 MR. KLOTZBUCHER: It's a form 11 objection. That's all I'm allowed to offer. 12 MR. MCGOWAN: Well, the form objection 13 is supposed to allow me to correct an improperly formed question so that it's admissible at trial down 14 15 the road; and if you don't have an actual form 16 objection, then I would ask you to not make that objection because it's just disruptive. 17 18 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question about the transplant? 19 20 BY MR. MCGOWAN: 21 Q. Yeah. So if you lose one kidney -- let's 22 take that analogy to you can have normal kidney 23 function and lose a whole kidney; right? 24 Α. Yeah. 2.5 Ο. All right. So does that still -- I mean, can

we extend that to say that	you can have and we'll
just for lay purposes call	it "dead kidney cells"
here and I know they're	glomeruli and all that good
stuff, but	

Α. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

-- that are not sufficient -- they're dead, they're gone, they're scarred up, nonfunctional -- but they do not rise to the level of causing kidney function impairment noticeable by lab at that time? MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: I think -- I mean, I think you're -- again, over the course -- I mean, I think you're conflating the -- well, let me just back up.

We probably have damage that goes on to our kidneys day in, day out, and these dead cells you referred to and scars and stuff happen. That's why our kidney function declines from about age 20 to the rest of our life. So that just happens.

Is that damage? Doesn't usually show you up as a functional abnormality.

Does it have consequences? Not for the vast majority of people.

So, you know, to say that -- to speculate

1 | that there's some theoretical damage that happens at a

- 2 | particular point in time but is not enough to show any
- 3 | functional consequence, you know, I mean, just --
- 4 possible? Maybe. But, I mean, there's just not a lot
- of evidence that that -- that you could hang your hat
- 6 on any one time point for that.
- 7 I mean, I'm sorry to be -- to not be more
- 8 | precise in the answer, but it's a really hypothetical
- 9 question.
- 10 BY MR. MCGOWAN:
- 11 Q. Well, I'm trying to not make it that way, but
- 12 | that's fine.
- 13 Tell me what chemicals Mr. Keller was
- 14 | exposed to at Camp Lejeune.
- MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection.
- 16 Foundation.
- 17 You may answer.
- 18 THE WITNESS: I mean, I know -- I mean,
- 19 I read the report once. So benzene. Maybe
- 20 trichloroethylene. I mean, they're in there; we could
- 21 | find them.
- 22 BY MR. MCGOWAN:
- Q. TCE, PCE, and benzene: does that ring a bell?
- A. Yeah, those sound -- those ring a bell.
- Q. Okay. Can you tell me what effect those

chemicals have on kidney function, or kidney cells?

- A. Yeah, not my area of expertise, and I can't -- as I said, I'm not a toxicologist.
- Q. Okay. So what did you do to rule out the contaminants in the water as affecting his kidneys?

 MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection.

7 Foundation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: The first records I had of his kidney function was that it was absolutely normal; so, therefore, I concluded that he hadn't had significant damage to interfere with his kidney function.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- Q. All right. Do you know how those chemicals work over time and latency periods and all that kind of stuff?
- A. I don't. I think it's known, but I -- that's not an area I'm familiar with.
 - Q. And you know his exposure levels?
- A. I know that he had some. I've seen in the other expert reports that you can make estimates of those and calculations of exposure and stuff, but that's, again, not my area of expertise.
 - Q. Do you agree with me that those chemicals are

- 1 known to cause kidney damage?
- 2 MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection.
- 3 | Foundation.
- 4 THE WITNESS: I don't know.
- 5 BY MR. MCGOWAN:
- Okay. So if you don't know the effect of 6 Ο. 7 those chemicals and his dosing and latency periods and all of that, and if you don't know the chemotherapy 8 9 regimen and the stem cell and the effect of the kidneys and all of that, how is it that you can 10 11 exclude those two as contributors to the problem? 12 can you not? You're just saying that diabetes was the 13 most prominent cause?
- MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.
- 15 BY MR. MCGOWAN:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- O. See the question I'm asking?
- A. Yeah. I mean, what you're asking is, if you have theoretical risks to kidney function, but that they don't show up in clinical measurements, is it possible that they were still part of the problem?

 And I can't answer that.
 - O. Just because --
- A. Because we don't -- there's not enough information, both from this patient and from the literature, to support that. Anything I said would be

-	l 7	7
Τ	purely	speculative.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. What exactly did the DoJ ask you to do in this case?
- A. They asked me to review the files and give an opinion on this man's clinical course.
 - Q. Okay. So --
- A. So my expertise in diabetes, so that's what I focused on.
- Q. Okay. But the specific question that you set out to answer was what?
- A. What was the likely cause of the kidney failure that manifests as dialysis in 2024?
- Q. Okay. So literally the question that was posed to you was: What was the likely cause of the kidney failure in Mr. Keller?
- A. It wasn't posed in a specific way, but the notion is that was what case was about, and so that's what I focused on.
- Q. All right. I need to -- if we need to take a moment to think, that's fine -- look at something -- but I need to know the specific question that you are answering in your report.
- A. The -- so I can tell you the specific question that I addressed in my report, but it wasn't given to me by the Department of Justice. It was my

interpretation of this is what this case is about, so
that's what I focused on. And what I focused on is
what's the likely cause of kidney failure of
end-stage renal disease in Mr. Keller.

- Q. You did not address, and do not now address, whether it is as likely as not that the water contamination was a contributing cause to his kidney failure; is that right?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. And you did not address the question as likely as not whether the treatment for the NHL was a contributing cause of his kidney failure; right?

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection.

14 Foundation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I didn't think
I could answer either of those, either based on my
experience or my literature review.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- Q. Was it ever shared to you the different standard of proof in this particular case?
 - A. I'm not sure I understand.

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection.

24 Foundation.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Well, you used the term "likely cause." And "likely" means more than 50 percent; is that fair?
 - Α. Yeah.
- Is that the way you used it in this case? Because I know medical folks, unless -- and I'm generalizing -- but in general, that if it's not 95 percent plus, a lot of medical folks are not willing to say something is a likely cause. Versus us legal people who "more likely than not" is 50 percent plus a little. Right?

And so when you're using the term "likely cause, " what level are you at when you're using it in your report? The medical side, which is more, or the legal side, which is half plus a little?

- The medical side.
- Okay. So how sure is the medical side of O. "likely cause"? And it doesn't have to be a specific Is it greater than 80 percent? 90 percent? number. Where would we need to fall?
- Yeah, so this man had risk factors for Α. chronic -- that is the -- all the necessary risk factors are there to explain his ultimate outcome based on, you know, what we have medical records for: so history of diabetes, his variable history of

high blood pressure, obesity, hypercholesterolemia, nonsteroidal painkillers, and hyperuricemia. are all well-established common causes of kidney disease.

And the time course is really important here because, you know, in general, people who have a noxious insult, whether it be from a hospitalization or other things, tend to manifest the insult right And this guy, it looks like he developed his kidney disease gradually, as we see with diabetes, hypertension, obesity, all of that stuff.

So that was -- I just -- I thought this looked like a fairly straightforward case of diabetic nephropathy in a man who had other risk factors. I thought the -- rather than saying -- you know, moving from 50 percent to 95 percent, I thought, from 100 percent down, how much would I give a contribution to his treatment for chemotherapy, and it's just infinitesimal.

- And in that conclusion, was the infinitesimalness -- that's probably a new word --
 - Yeah, good one. Α.
- -- is not based on knowing the precision of the chemotherapy and the stem cell and all of that, and its effect on kidney function and latency, nor the

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

chemicals to which he was exposed and the latency for that?

A. Yeah, I don't know the -- I don't know anything about the chemicals.

The latency for kidney failure after stem cell transplant or lots of aggressive cancer treatments is a year. You see the abnormality right away, like I said. That's a short latency. And that had a lot to do with my interpretation, the fact that this guy got out of the hospital, got away from his stem cell therapy, maintained a normal creatinine for several years.

So I think, in general, gradual kidney failure is what you see with the kinds of problems he had; whereas kidney failure related to, you know, intensive medical therapy, like you'd get with a stem cell transplant, tends to manifest right away.

So "latency" is a good term that -- your term -- the latency here matters.

- Q. Okay. So how much experience do you have in evaluating the kidney function or kidney damage -- either one -- in patients that have undergone NHL treatment or who have been exposed to TCE, PCE, and benzene?
 - A. Very little. None.

2.0

Q. Okay. So I'm still struggling with the
you can have and this is hypothetical, and this is
part of the fun of being a trial lawyer, I've found,
is that we get to learn a lot of things from educated
people and then go about our business and forget about
it later is that you can chemicals, or whatever
it is, an insult, can damage the kidney, and you can
have kidney-damaged dead cells and yet it will not be
evident on lab work.

The penultimate example would be you have donated a kidney, you have one less kidney, and yet your lab work is completely normal. Right? You can have dead kidney cells that do not yet rise to the level -- or cause of functional impairment?

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.

You may answer.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- Q. That's true; right?
- A. That's theoretical.
- Q. Yeah, but there's nothing wrong with the -- I mean, that's a true statement; right?
- A. Yeah, I mean, I agree about the kidney transplant. The -- you know, the damage -- the supposed damage that's not -- that's there but not able to be seen on function, I'd have to see some

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

evidence that showed that that was true. Yeah.

- Q. Okay. So in your view, any damage to kidney cells should result in function impairment?
- A. I just think we don't know a lot about damage in people with normal function because we don't study them very much. We don't do kidney biopsies on them and say, "There was damage, but there was normal function."
- Q. Well, is it your view, then, that any damage to the kidney will cause functional impairment?

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.

12 You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Again, that's the flip side of the same question we can't answer. That is, we don't have a lot of data on normal kidneys -- or damaged kidneys or normal kidneys and function because we don't biopsy those people; we don't look for abnormalities.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- Q. All right. So do you hold the belief, one way or the other, as to whether you can have damaged kidney cells, glomeruli --
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. -- that does not give rise, at that point, to functional impairment?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	A. Let me see if I can say this a different way.
2	I regardless of how many damaged cells
3	this guy had in 2001, do I think that that damage
4	contributed to his kidney disease? I do not.
5	Q. Tell me the precise medical and factual basis
6	for that opinion, please.
7	A. Yeah. So that opinion is just that any he
8	was able to sustain normal kidney function for three
9	years after his stem cell transplant, and there's just
10	not a lot of evidence that had he had nothing else
11	that he not had gout, that he not had diabetes, that
12	he not had hypertension that this would lead to
13	eventual end-stage renal disease.
14	Q. Okay. Well, tell me 40 percent of type 2
15	diabetics have impaired renal function?
16	A. Yeah. Somewhere between 30 and 40 percent.
17	Q. So if you're counseling a patient with type 2
18	diabetes, you say legally "It is less likely
19	than not that you're going to get kidney disease"
20	MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection
21	BY MR. MCGOWAN:
22	Q because it's 30 to 40 percent; right?
23	MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Foundation.
24	You may answer.
25	THE WITNESS: Yeah, so what I tell

Page 40 of 123

1 people is -- when I see them for the first time -- is,

- "Our goal here is to try and prevent you from having 2
- 3 kidney disease, and we don't know exactly what the
- 4 various risks are, but we know that if we treat your
- blood pressure and we treat your glucose, it's more 5
- likely -- you'll have a better likelihood of not 6
- having kidney disease."
- BY MR. MCGOWAN: 8
- 9 Did Mr. Keller have uncontrolled
- hypertension? 10
- 11 He had several episodes of elevated blood Α.
- 12 sugar -- blood pressures, at least one up to 99 and --
- 13 but it wasn't a prominent part of his treatment
- 14 history. At least Dr. Leach didn't talk about it very
- 15 much.
- 16 Okay. So did you, for the purposes of your
- work in this case, assume that he had uncontrolled 17
- 18 hypertension?
- 19 Α. No.
- 20 Did you credit hypertension as being a
- 21 contributing cause of the kidney failure?
- 22 I did not. Α.
- 23 MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection.
- 24 BY MR. MCGOWAN:
- 2.5 Ο. The way that diabetes -- uncontrolled

diabetes causes kidney failure more often than controlled diabetes?

A. Yeah, I mean, what I would say is that there are some factors that we can impact that will decrease your risk of kidney failure, and blood sugar is -- treating blood sugar is one of them.

If you have bad genetics -- and we know that susceptibility to diabetic complications, to a certain extent, is bred in the bone; I mean, some people are more susceptible than others -- that's something we can't affect. So we treat the things we can affect.

But uncontrolled blood sugar is definitely a risk for progression to kidney disease.

- Q. Did Mr. Keller have genetic predisposition?
- A. Don't know.
- Q. Is it accepted that the lower the Alc, chronically over time, the less likely you are to get kidney disease? Do those track?
- A. Yeah. No, those are -- that's been done in clinical trials, where one group gets usual care and one group gets more aggressive care, and the Alc in the usual care is 9 percent, and the Alc in the intensive group is 7 percent, and the group with 7 percent, over five years, has half the kidney disease as the other group.

Q. If a diabetic is controlled their Alc	is
controlled to normal or prediabetic levels, do they	Y
show a rise in kidney disease frequency?	

That's a good question. We don't know. Α. We haven't had drugs yet that would do that -- that would absolutely normalize blood sugar. So even in these clinical trials, the intensively treated group just got to an Alc of 7, where an Alc of less than 5.8 is considered normal.

So we don't have great information even that 6.5 is better than 7, or 6 is better than 6.5. But we know that 7 is better than 9, and it's been done a couple of times. And so we're pretty confident that high blood sugar is worse.

- All right. So 7 -- how much better is 7 than 9 on -- for preventing or stemming kidney disease?
- 50 percent better. But again, it's a finite time period: it's five years. And that's actually short in the development -- you know, that's kind of what it takes to see diabetic kidney disease. a lot of people play out over longer periods of time.
- So there's not science to support it yet, but the theory would be that lower -- normal -- if you get down to normal, hopefully it would be a normal risk of kidney disease, which --

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1		

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

(Over-speaking.)

No, I think that's what every --Yeah. that's the assumption. And most of the data would suggest that diabetic -- that the common diabetic complications -- eye disease and kidney disease -- the lower, the better.

Now, what we really know is that if your Alc is 12, then your rates are really high, and that you get more bang for your buck going from 12 to 7 than from 7 down. So it's a kind of a -- it's not a linear curve.

O. Okay. And it's the -- then it's the level of sugar in the blood that causes the inflammation, or whatever it is --

(Over-speaking.)

Well, I mean, that's the association. you know, we know that glucose is filtered by the glomeruli, and we know that it goes into the kidney tubules, and we know that over time the glomeruli and the kidney tubules are damaged. And in just a wide variety of models from cells to animals to humans, you can show that having hyperglycemia affects kidney function in whatever measurement you're making.

So hyperglycemia is an insult to kidney function.

Q.	So	high	blood	sugar	î is	an	insult	to	your
kidney,	and	the	higher,	, the	more	e ir	nsulting	, it	is?

Α. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- All right. So list for me -- and use your O. report if you need to -- what his blood sugar levels were up until the time of his diagnosis of Stage 3, which I believe was 2012.
- Yeah, so I -- I have -- so he had -- the only blood sugars I found were during his hospitalization for bronchitis in 1999, and he had mildly elevated blood sugars in the hospital there.
 - Was he also on steroids at that time? O.
 - Α. He was.
- Can prednisone cause a transient rise in Ο. blood sugar?
 - Oh, yeah. Α.
- Do you attribute that to -- that rise at that time to that?
- Well, what I always use it as is as a hint that somebody's prone to diabetes. That is, most people don't get hyperglycemic on steroids, but if you do get hyperglycemic on steroids, that's -- it's kind of a prediabetic challenge. And people who are prone to diabetes are more likely to get high.

So I -- when I see a patient like that in

the	hospital,	I	always	worry	that	I	ask	him	"Has	
your	family g	jot	diabete	es?" (Oftent	imes	it	does.	So	

- Q. And you might mention it to him and say, "You want to be looking out for that in the future"?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. So what was his blood sugar level at that time?
 - A. He got up to 186.
 - Q. Was that a fasting sugar?
 - A. I don't know. It was a random sugar.
- Q. And so what's a high number for a random sugar?
- A. Well, 186 -- if we do a glucose tolerance test on you -- that is, give you 75 grams of glucose to drink -- normal is considered less than 140.

So, you know, a random blood sugar over 200, on two occasions, is diabetes. But somewhere in between there, we would say you're glucose intolerant.

Q. Does that matter? Like, timing of -- between the time you ate lunch to --

(Over-speaking.)

A. Oh, yeah, I mean, there's -- yeah. Formal -- formally, you'd do it with a -- you'd do a two- -- you'd give the glucose and you measure two hours later, and that's how you define normal glucose

1	tolerance.
_	LOTEL allee.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- Q. Okay. I think pregnant women sometimes go through that?
 - A. More than anybody else right now.
 - Q. I gotcha. Okay.

So but 186 random: are you telling me that's an elevated sugar or that might be an elevated sugar?

- A. It might be an elevated sugar. That would be one -- I mean, just as you said, this would be one where I would say to the patient, "That's not a diabetic blood sugar, but that's higher than most guys, and we should watch that going forward."
- Q. Okay. Unless you discovered that the lab was drawn 20 minutes after he had lunch?
 - A. No.
 - O. No? Doesn't matter?
- A. No, not at all. I mean, most of us that don't have diabetes never get a blood sugar over 140.
 - Q. All right. So tell me -- that was in 1999 -- (Over-speaking.)
- A. Yeah. And then, again, I was -- the next blood sugars I see -- (as read):

"Dr. Leach noted a diagnosis of type 2 diabetes dating from 2009, but there are no medical

1	records There is a comment in
2	Dr. Leach's notes from November
3	2012 that hemoglobin Alc was above
4	goal and required attention."
5	Don't see a number for that.
6	Here no, that's uric acid.
7	"He was encouraged"
8	May 9th, 2013, last Alc measure had been
9	8.6 percent. So that was the first Alc I saw in the
10	records that I got.
11	Q. And that was after his diagnosis of kidney
12	disease Stage 3, which was in 2012?
13	A. Yeah. Yeah.
14	Q. Okay. So do you have any blood sugar data
15	prior to his diagnosis for Stage 3 kidney disease?
16	A. Just the just the remarks in the chart
17	that he had a diagnosis of diabetes from before that.
18	But I don't have any blood there was no blood sugar
19	in the records that I got.
20	Q. And there were no there were no point
21	what do you call those, like, when you have an actual
22	blood sugar level versus an Alc? Because Alc is,
23	like, for a period of time; right?
24	A. Yeah.

It's a marker of, like, the last three months

25

Q.

1 or something?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Α. Exactly.
- And then the other one -- like, if you do a Ο. finger stick, that's --

(Over-speaking.)

- Or a venous blood draw. So a finger stick --Α. a point-of-care, they call them -- or just a venous blood draw for -- I didn't see any of those, or see any remarks about high blood sugars there, no.
- O. And in the medical records from the hospitals, is blood sugar a -- is that part of the normal Chem 7?
 - Yes, it is. Α.
- 14 Okay. So if they're doing a basic chemistry, Ο. 15 it should show up?
 - Α. Yeah.
 - And then hemoglobin Alc, that is the longer-term measure, which can be diagnostic of diabetes as well, and is also a measure of control; is that right?
 - Α. Yes.
 - And the goal is to get people less than 7?
 - Yeah, I mean, the goal is to establish a target that's best for the patient. In general, we talk about 7 as being a goal for preventing

1	complications.
_	Compercace on .

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. And I think that maybe older patients, that (indiscernible) up a little bit --

(Over-speaking.)

- A. Yeah, exactly.
- Q. -- because the burden of treatment is more than --
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. -- not enough juice in the squeeze?
- A. Yeah.
 - Q. Okay. So in terms of what his actual blood sugars were between 1998 and 2012, we have a single point of 186, point-of-care, while he was on steroids in the hospital --
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. -- and that itself was not diagnostic?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. And so we're assuming that he had elevated blood sugars up until his diagnosis of Stage 3 chronic kidney disease, but we don't know the numbers?
 - A. Yeah. That was my assumption based on the medical records.
 - Q. And we also are assuming that that level was high enough to cause kidney injury in whatever period of time it would -- how long would you normally expect

that to take?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

For -- I mean, it's hard to say, but usually that takes years, three to five years, to start to manifest.

In type 1 diabetes, we always think of it as five years; and the reason is because Type 1 patients tend to be young -- juvenile onset is what they used to call it -- and only have diabetes as their -- you know, they're otherwise pretty fit.

In type 2 diabetes, it's hard to say because they're older patients, and they -- besides diabetes, they are almost always obese, they frequently have high blood pressure, they have a bunch of other meds. But I would say it plays out over three to five years to get started, and you can have, you know, Stage 3 kidney disease inside of eight years.

- Q. So Stage 3 within eight years. Is there a normal -- because, I mean, assuming that you could track people's data -- I quess you can with Type 1s; right?
 - Mm-hmm. Α.
- That you can -- most of the time, you start seeing abnormalities in the GFRs and the creatinines in normal everyday physical blood tests; right?
 - Α. Yeah.

- Ο. Because that's normally what's also checked as part of a physical on a yearly basis?
 - It's part of your Chem 7.
- That's a pretty standard lab. There's Ο. probably 10,000 of them going on right this second?
- Α. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.5

- And what you see is a gradual rise in Q. Okay. those numbers, usually?
 - Yeah -- well, in somebody who's developing CKD.
 - Understood. Ο.

And that rise can be more accelerated in some patients and less in others?

- Α. Absolutely.
- And in some patients, it can be a low rise in your Stage 1, and it's medically treated with lifestyle modification, maybe some medicines -- blood pressure medicines, what have you, lisinoprils --
 - Yeah. Α.
 - -- and things that help the kidneys?
- Yeah. Α.
- 22 And I guess there are some new-generation 23 drugs for that now: There's Ozempic and all that kind of stuff --24
 - Α. Yep.

- Q. -- that's showing some promise in that already also?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. So the data -- the assumption that we have to make that -- let me make this clear. You are not here to say that diabetes was the sole cause of his kidney disease; right?

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: I mean, I don't think
I can say that.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- Q. How does obesity cause kidney disease? Is it what obesity causes which then causes it? Or is there something about being overweight that actually affects the cells?
 - A. It's --
- Q. Or is that a Nobel Prize that we'll win if we figure it out?
- A. Yeah. If you want to take some time off, maybe this summer, we can work on that.

But no, it comes up all the time. So it's an association. But you're right, the company that obesity keeps -- hypertension, dyslipidemia, diabetes -- they all add.

I think most of the data suggests that being heavier, per se, adds to the risk for CKD. But the mechanisms are so hard to separate out because of, as you say, there's a lot of confounders. But, I mean, the -- for the last 15 years, that's been -- you know, that's the kind of stuff that gets into textbooks because enough people agree that that is a risk factor.

Now -- well, I won't --

- Q. Yeah, but whether being overweight is the direct cause of kidney disease or not is --
- A. I guess what I would say is how much it is a cause. What is the percentage contribution it makes to your development of CKD is unknown.
 - O. I see.
- Now, dyslipidemia: that's high cholesterol, basically?
- A. Yeah.
- Q. Okay. So how does that play into causing kidney disease?
 - A. Atherosclerosis and vascular damage.
- Q. So just less blood vessel to and through the kidney, basically?
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. Okay. Have you ever --

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

24

	lage 31
1	(Off-record comment.)
2	BY MR. MCGOWAN:
3	Q. Has anybody ever studied a patient like
4	Mr. Keller who's had toxic exposure, he's had chemo
5	stem cell, and he's got type 2 diabetes, and its
6	relation to kidney disease?
7	MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.
8	You may answer.
9	THE WITNESS: You know, has anybody,
10	say, taken one of those people and done a detailed
11	study of that particular person? Or has anybody
12	looked at the question broadly?
13	BY MR. MCGOWAN:
14	Q. Yeah, so let's look at let's talk about
15	three factors, and we can combine them however we
16	want. But, you know, broadly speaking
17	MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Counsel, I'm sorry to
18	interrupt. We have been going about an hour. I don't
19	know if anyone wants a break or if the doctor needs a
20	break
21	MR. MCGOWAN: Anytime is fine.
22	THE WITNESS: Yeah, it sounds like this
23	is a watershed, but why don't I go shed some water.
24	MR. MCGOWAN: Sounds good.
25	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record at

1 9:58 a.m.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

(Recess taken from 9:58 a.m. to 10:04 a.m.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: On the record at

4 | 10:04 a.m.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

Q. All right, Doctor, we're back from a break. But I think the subject matter we were talking about was the combination of patients that had chemical exposures, chemo stem cell treatments, and diabetes. Okay? So --

- A. Okay.
- Q. -- has there been studies of patient populations that had kidney disease and two or more of that list of three?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. Okay. So you're aware of no evidence that -or there's no medical studies -- no medical evidence
 that's been compiled yet that knows what to do with a
 patient like Mr. Keller who had all three of those,
 and its contribution to kidney disease?
 - A. Yeah, I couldn't find anything.
- Q. Did you search for that kind of stuff?
- 23 A. Oh, yeah.
- Q. Let's go -- I'm going to go through your report, and we're not going to read the whole thing,

1 but there are just some questions I have.

- A. Mm-hmm.
- Q. Did you write this yourself, or did you have assistance with it?
 - A. No, I wrote it myself.
 - Q. Okay.

2

5

6

7

8

9

19

20

21

22

- A. I write semi-professionally.
- Q. I'd like to say I do, too, but mostly it's lawsuits and junk that they're not nearly as exciting.
- Okay. And I'm on page 4 of 27. It's about his creatinine in July of 2023 noted to be 1.4.
- 12 A. Yeah.
- Q. I looked it up -- because, you know,
- 14 Dr. Google --
- 15 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- and normal creatinine for a man is -- and how old he would have been at the time -- would have been 1.1 to 1.3? The high limit?
 - A. Yeah. Again, did you -- did Dr. Google mention what the normative range was in 2003? Because it's changed over time.
 - Q. No. That's why you get the medium-sized bucks, Doctor.
- A. Yeah. You understand endocrinology, it sounds like.

- But I think your point is well taken, that a 1.4 is either the upper limit -- in the upper limit of normal or just over the upper limit of normal.
 - And we don't have other data until, basically, 2012?
 - Yeah. Well, 2012, I think, is -- yeah, that's when he's referred to Dr. Leach.
 - And by then -- at or about that time, it was diagnosed as Stage 3?
 - Α. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- So if we track a normal course of Stage 3 kidney disease, six to eight years, that would track --
 - Yeah. Α.
- 16 -- as being the beginning? Ο.
 - If we -- oh, you're saying if we went backwards from 2012 to 2004?
 - Well, we only have two data points, and the question is whether we can reasonably connect the dots, or if it's just so random that you just couldn't do that?
 - You know, could this be that that 1.4 was the beginning of that progression that was finally -the other data point we got to in 2012 was Stage 3?

	_
1	A. I thought that
2	MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.
3	You may answer.
4	THE WITNESS: I thought that your
5	what did you say? We could connect the dots or it was
6	random?
7	BY MR. MCGOWAN:
8	Q. Yeah.
9	A. I thought it was likely to be random. But
10	I think, you know, it's a either way, we would be
11	making inferences based on really, really limited
12	data.
13	Q. Okay. So well, there's a conclusion it's
14	either random or could be connected. So why did you
15	choose it was random versus not? Just
16	(Over-speaking.)
17	A. Just because that would be a number that
18	small would be well, I thought I think that's a
19	kind of number that can be part of day-to-day
20	variation.
21	If that number had been 1.8, 1.9, then
22	I would have been much more suspicious that he had
23	active disease going on then.
24	Q. Is it as likely as not that that 1.4 was

25

the -- was connected to the Stage 3 CKD that was

1	diagnosed	in	2012?

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection.

You may answer.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- Q. Even money, Doctor.
- A. Yeah, I have no way to say. As likely as not? I would say less likely. That is, I think this is more likely to just be random variation because the number is so small. That would be -- that would be my intuition. That's the way I'd frame it. I couldn't show you a study that had 1,000 patients with that number.
- Q. Do you have any viewpoint on when the chronic kidney disease was clinically evident to start?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. So a normal course of Stage 3 CKD would be six to eight years, generally?
- A. I would say, you know, could be three to eight. You know, sometimes it's faster than other times.
- Q. Okay. Is there any way to accurately or reasonably backdate when Mr. Keller would have had the first clinical indication of kidney impairment based upon the sole piece of data 2012 Stage 3?
 - A. No. I don't have -- there was no data --

that was the first thing -- that was my first paragraph, was there was no data to say when he started having kidney disease -- when he had clinically apparent kidney disease and when he had diabetes. There's a huge gap there.

Because we know he had an Alc of 8.6 in 2013, and he was on -- when did we see that he was on glimepiride?

I mean, again, we are making inferences about both of those diagnoses, when they started, CKD and diabetes, and somewhere between, I would say, 2003 and 2012 for the kidney disease.

- Does it matter which occurred first --Ο.
- Well, I mean --Α.
 - -- in your opinion? Ο.
- Yeah. If he had diabetes, and that was the cause of his kidney disease, it does matter.
- And what if his kidney disease was before he had diabetes?
- Then the diabetes would have contributed to Α. its progression, but it wouldn't be the initial insult.
- And so there's no data to know whether we have chicken or the egg in this particular case; is that true?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. Well, there's -- when you have gaps in the medical database like this, there's no way to know a lot of stuff.

What I said in my report, and I think is pretty well documented in the literature, is that at the time most people are diagnosed with type 2 diabetes, they've had subclinical disease for three or four years. And I gave the references; they're in there.

And so if in -- my calculation was if -- if he had a diagnosis of type 2 diabetes in 2008 or '9, which we infer from Leach's records and some of the records further on, then he probably was having hyperglycemia starting in 2003, '4, '5, because that would be the normal course for most people with diabetes.

Again, all projections. But in a -- you know, when there's a big gap in the records, what I -- what I was doing was projecting what I thought was most likely based on -- you know, most people with type 2 diabetes, hyperglycemic before it has a long subclinical period, so I thought that -- I thought that held up pretty well.

Q. I'm curious that -- isn't it normal for the care of a diabetic patient to do basic labs?

I mean, were you a little struck by, you know, "Where's the data?" Because that's about as basic -- I mean, that's blocking and tackling, it

- A. I mean, I asked a lot of those questions myself. I mean, I've been to Walla Walla. It's not, you know, Afghanistan or something. They have doctors and clinics and stuff. I just -- I couldn't believe that there wasn't some more documentation. And this is a man that had had a serious illness. His oncologist said he was in remission, but then he seemed to get out of the medical system for a long period of time.
- Q. And can you see signs and symptoms -- or signs of diabetes in something as basic as a urine dipstick?
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. Sugar in the urine?
- 19 A. Yeah.

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

2.5

seems like.

- Q. That's the way it used to be diagnosed; right?
 - A. Yeah. Diabetes smell, it is sweet urine.
 - Q. Yeah. Doctors used to do that. That's the way they knew. It's true.
 - All right. Let's -- did you ever see the

original -- and now I'm on page 5. It's "Dr. Leach noted a diagnosis of type 2 diabetes dating from 2009."

Did you ever see the origin document of that?

A. No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And then we have Dr. Leach's note from November of 2012, which just says his Alc was above goal, but we don't know what -- how much it was?
 - A. No.
- Q. What would be a goal for a patient like Mr. Keller? Is that keep it below 7? Below 8? What's -- and I guess it would be back then because that's now 13 years ago.
- A. If I'd have seen him then, at his age,
 I would have had a goal of 7. And I think, you
 know -- I mean, you correctly alluded to the fact that
 older, sicker patients, you don't run them so tight.
 But I think most non-endocrinologists would say the
 Alc goal is 7. And that was what I assumed of
 Dr. Leach; I assumed it was over 7 then.
 - Q. And we don't know if it was 7.1 or 12.9?
 - A. We don't.
- Q. Okay. What can you infer from the medicine that was given, the glimepiride? What is it?

That's not an insulin --

A. No.

- Q. -- so we didn't need that at that point. And it's not Glucophage?
 - A. No.
- Q. And -- tell me how that acts and its roll in treating.
- A. So glimepiride is part of the sulfonylurea class of drugs that go back to the '50s. So those are really old diabetes drugs. Glimepiride is a new sulfonylurea that came out in the '80s --
 - Q. 45 years ago now.
- A. Yeah. And it -- these drugs stimulate the pancreas to make more insulin than it would normally. And the notion is that people with type 2 diabetes still make insulin, they just don't make enough, so the sulfonylurea kind of gives them a little boost, a little kick. They're easy to prescribe, they're once a day, and they're almost free, they're so cheap. And so it's, you know, a common drug to start.

I mean, usually you would start metformin. That's the current recommendation. But not unusual for a primary care doctor, particularly one that was trained when I was trained, in the '80s, to use sulfonylurea first. So you just put people on it.

I mean, the reason we don't use them is that if you have borderline diabetes, you can actually get hypoglycemic with these drugs, unlike with, say, Glucophage metformin. But this is not a -- this is an old-timey drug, but it would be a common primary care prescription early on with somebody --

(Over-speaking.)

- Q. -- it was more common 13 years ago than it is today, probably?
 - A. Yeah. Yeah.
 - Q. Does that have any impact on kidney function?
- A. No. Not except -- except that in one of the studies that showed that lowering blood sugar decreased kidney function, a sulfonylurea was one of the intensive treatments.
- So, again, it doesn't impair kidney function, but if it lowers blood sugar adequately and for enough time, it will decrease the risk of diabetic kidney disease.
 - Q. The next paragraph down here --
 - A. Is this on 4 still?
- Q. Yes, sir -- actually, it's 5, and I'm in the middle paragraph --
 - A. "Mr. Keller was seen by Leach"?
 - Q. Yes, sir. And (as read):

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

"•	ł	nad	dec.	line	d as	ind	icate	d by
a	GFR	of	32,	and	his	uri	c acid	f
le ⁻	vel	was	s ele	evate	ed t	o gr	eater	than
10	. "							

Was that indicative, in your view, of the kidney disease?

A. I -- it was hard to say. I mean, this is a guy that had clinical gout. Again, in notes that are ten years after this one, somebody refers to him having his gout diagnosed with an aspiration of a gouty elbow. So he had clinical gout.

High uric acid is a risk factor -- one of the primary risk factors for gout. But this could also be high because his GFR is 32. So no way to say for sure that it was -- you know, he may have had high uric acid as a precipitant of his gout. We don't have those numbers. But you're also correct in your inference that a GFR of 32 can cause you to not excrete as much uric acid. 10 is still a high number.

- Q. And gout is, like, crystallized --
- A. Uric acid --

(Over-speaking.)

- Q. -- uric acid in your joints?
- A. When they precipitate in the joint space, you get inflammation and arthritis.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Okay. According to this, it says -- in that sentence I'm reading, it says, "At that time" -- which would be, I guess, around this 2023, May -- he was taking glimepiride and sitagliptin?
 - Α. Sitagliptin.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Sitagliptin. What kind of drug of is?
- Sitagliptin is another -- it's a newer pill. Α. It's not a sulfonylurea. It actually prevents -- so you'd already alluded to Ozempic, or semaglutide, which is based on a hormone that the gut makes called GLP-1. When we eat, GLP-1 goes up; it helps us secrete insulin. But GLP-1 isn't -- it's degraded quickly in the plasma. Sitagliptin prevents that. So, again, it's another way to boost insulin secretion. Very popular in primary care.
- It looks like 2012/2013 his -- he had an Alc of 10.7. That's really pretty high?
 - Α. Yeah, 10.7 is pretty high.
- Does one -- if you're treating a patient who's presumably taking their medicine, and their Alc is continuing to rise, that's not uncommon?
 - Α. No.
- And you have to change the medical management.
 - And, in fact, his was ultimately changed

again. I believe he was put on insulin at some point?

- A. Yeah. Soon thereafter.
- I mean, this is -- this is a common scenario for somebody -- for an endocrinologist, is that the primary care doctors are uncomfortable with insulin, and they oftentimes don't have the resources to get people started on insulin, so they'll use pills, and they'll use -- the patient will come in and say, "Well, I know my Alc is high, Doc, but I'll follow my diet. This is going to get better." And that will go on for a while, and the doc will keep giving them pills and they need to be on insulin, and then they come to us, and we put them on insulin.

So this is not an uncommon scenario, to have a patient whose diabetes is being managed by primary care on pills that aren't effective.

- Q. And probably every patient says, "I promise, Doctor, I'm going to eat better and I'm going to get more exercise"?
 - A. I've been fooled many times.
 - Q. Easy to say and hard to do. I get it.
- All right. So it looks like -- I'm in the next paragraph now, 2018.
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. Macular degeneration: Is that a complication

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- of some other illness? Or is that sort of a primary --
 - As far as I know, it's a primary illness. Α. it's not diabetic retinopathy, if that's what you're asking.
 - Which is basically where the vessels in your back of your eye, they leak, basically?
 - Yeah. Macular degeneration is a separate diagnosis. And I -- to my knowledge -- well, my knowledge is not worth recounting on that.
 - O. All right. So in October of 2028, his GFR was mildly reduced to 32 with moderate proteinuria. And that is the same number, at least -- the GFR of 32 was from 2013. Does that mean that his kidney disease had plateaued, do you think?
 - Yeah. Again, when the kidney function gets to be that level, just small differences in, you know, hydration can make a big difference, and so the -- the variability is wide.
 - I -- you know, I've seen people on their way down to dialysis stabilize. I've seen them drop and come back. But it starts to be -- I mean, once it gets to 32, it's not -- you know, unless -- it's not likely to stay there for a long time, like years.
 - O. So how do you -- how do we explain or talk

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

about that in 2013 his GFR was 32, and there doesn't
appear to be and in August of 2013, it was 45. Is
that a material difference? Or is that just kind of a
measurement?

Yeah, it could be -- you can see that kind of variability, not day-to-day, but over time --

(Doctor's pager alerts.)

- If you need to take that, you're welcome, Ο. Doctor.
 - I don't. I don't. Α. Sorry.

Yeah, I -- to my way of thinking, he had -he still had borderline kidney function, and it hadn't -- it certainly hadn't gotten better from '13 to '18. And I think we see further on that his eGFR will go up and down several times over the course of the rest of the report.

So, yeah, could he have plateaued? Could have, but it turned out he didn't.

- Well, the more data that we have -- and this is on the next page, page 6. It says November of 2019, his GFR was 29?
- Yeah. But again -- so, and then -- then it Α. was 26. And then it was 30.

So, again, there's a -- as you start to get kidney function, there's a lot less reserve and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

there's a lot more wobble, and small things like blood pressure, hydration, other medicines can have a -- can push that number around a little bit.

- Q. It looks like in June of 2022, his GFR was 27?
 - A. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Which is bouncing around for the last -- looks like probably ten years, I guess?
- A. Yeah. And that -- you know, that -- when it gets under 30 -- now, again, it shows you the arbitrariness of the stages of CKD -- but now when he's 27, he's Stage 4. That's under 30, but again, you know, in reality, we just know that that's bad, and it's -- the difference between a 27 and a 31, it's a continuous variable.
 - Q. You got to draw the line somewhere?
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. I understand.

When does one go on dialysis?

A. Usually it's -- once the eGFR gets under 50 -- 15, you're starting to think about it. But you wouldn't put somebody on a dialysis just for that number. What you look for is are they having trouble excreting potassium. So if the potassium is really high, that can be dangerous. Are they having trouble

excreting acid; so their bicarbonate is low. And then are they having symptoms of uremia; are they confused, fatigued, do they have heart failure.

So, you know, it's a clinical decision that a nephrologist makes. And sometimes I've seen people with eGFRs of 8, you know, tank along for a while; and then I've seen people go on dialysis for eGFRs in the 20s, if they're having some acute problem related to kidney impairment.

- It appears, at least from your report, that Ο. he at one point got off all of the diabetic medication?
 - Α. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Okay. How's that work? Ο.
- The paradox of renal failure is -- one of my professors told me it's an irony that you see all the time -- somebody whose blood sugar has never been controlled until they have the ultimate complication.

So a couple of things have happened here. One, he's lost weight over time; and that -- I was attributing that to just progressive renal failure, where weight loss is a thing. So this is a guy that, you know, I think when we met him, his body weight was around 250, plus or minus 20 pounds, and at some point in the late 20-teens, he gets down to body weights of

1 | 170, 180. So just that amount of weight loss can improve your diabetes a lot.

The other thing is, as your GFR gets low, the amounts of insulin that you secrete aren't cleared anymore. About half the insulin that we make gets filtered through the kidneys and out. So all of a sudden, an insufficient amount of insulin starts to be more.

So this is really typical of a diabetic patient who's approaching end stage, is that you start throwing all the diabetes medicines off. It becomes a hypoglycemia risk for them.

- Q. "Congratulations, you don't have diabetes anymore, but" --
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. -- "but your kidneys are shot"?
 - A. That's the -- that's the irony.
 - O. Yeah.

All right, let's talk about the opinion part, and then we'll --

- A. Yeah.
- Q. I was hoping it was going to be shorter, but we're going to be here for a minute. I'm on page 6.
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. (As read):

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

" chronic renal failure, with
steady worsening from 2012 through
the present clearly documented
in the notes from [the nephrology
clinicl."

I think we covered all of that. The first time that we would have seen that would have been in that 2012 note that said Stage 3 CKD?

- A. And I would just add that, like the diabetes, we don't know what the number was that caused him to be referred.
- Q. In the next bit, were he to have a biopsy, you could -- there's signature findings on kidney tissue that a pathologist could look for to identify the cause?
- A. Yeah, if they'd have done it ten years before. Once the kidneys get -- that is -- there's a lot of reasons to get chronic kidney disease. As the GFR goes down, and you get more and more dead cells and scar and fibrosis and stuff, they all start to look alike.
 - O. I see.
- A. Similarly, you know, you do images and the kidneys just gradually sort of atrophy. And so, you know, when you look at biopsies and things, it's hard

	to	tell	what	the	actual	cause	was.
--	----	------	------	-----	--------	-------	------

Q. At this point?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- A. At this point. This --
- Q. Presumably --
- A. At this point, you're talking about, you know, a scarred, fried, kidney.
- Q. Okay. Tell me exactly what you understand Dr. Felsher's opinion about the contribution of the cancer treatment to the kidney disease?

MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Objection. Form.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I couldn't make much of it. He mentioned it in two or three places in his opinion but didn't discuss it very much.

There was a lot of interesting stuff in there about lymphoma and the genesis of lymphoma and cancer genetics and things like that, but I -- he just didn't discuss it enough. He just mentioned it twice -- that the kidney disease and the heart disease were related to the treatment of lymphoma.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- Q. Do you believe that the heart disease in this case was related to the kidney disease?
- A. I mean, it's -- again, it's like we were saying about obesity and kidney disease. So diabetes

is a big risk for heart disease, and kidney disease is a -- both of those things promote atherosclerosis.

But he also had hypercholesterolemia that probably contributed. So multifactorial cause of heart disease.

But certainly 75 percent of people with type 2 diabetes die of heart disease, and it's 50 or 60 percent of people with CKD die of heart disease. So both of those things go together with -- and he had ischemic heart disease. Now, he may -- they called it ischemic heart disease.

Again, by the time he was getting all his cardiac workup, he could have had -- there's a diabetic cardiomyopathy that's non-ischemic. But at that point, we're just talking about a beat-up heart. He did have some vascular disease, so we could say he had atherosclerosis too.

Q. You wrote (as read):

"Moreover, there was no evidence from his basic lab tests that his kidney function had declined in the three years after his chemotherapy and SCT, which would be expected if these were the cause of eventual CKD."

2.5

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Tell me your basis for having a three-year -- your basis for that statement.
- A. My basis for that statement were, you know, some observational studies, both prospective and retrospective, that looked at kidney function in people after hematopoietic stem cells, and the people that got kidney disease got it in the first year, but I extended it to say, you know, it might go two or three years.
 - Q. Okay. So which study was that? Because --
- A. This would be in the supplemental data that we sent to you. The -- what did we call that?
 - O. Materials Considered list?
- A. Yeah.
 - Q. We love to say that. It's fancy -(Over-speaking) --
- A. Yeah. So there's five papers listed there.

 One, I realize, I sent the wrong PMID number because it's totally irrelevant, it's about colon cancer. But there's some series, one from Fred Hutchinson in Seattle, that talk about this -- talk about kidney function and after stem cell therapy.
- Q. So did you read those studies before you wrote the report? Or did you --

- A. No, afterwards. I mean, I read -- no, I read them before the report.
 - Q. Okay. And they just -- I know you had a lot of references -- it just fell off the list, basically?
- A. Yeah. I mean, again, it wasn't diabetes related, so...

We're on page 7?

Q. Yes, sir.

All right. I'm at, basically, the first paragraph, about NSAIDs. Tell me -- that's, like, ibuprofen? "Vitamin I," as many people call it?

- A. Yeah.
- Q. Apparently that's bad for your kidneys?
- 14 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 15 O. How so?
 - A. I mean, they -- part of their mechanism of action, I mean, inhibiting anti-inflammatory molecules, can be damaging to the kidneys. And they're concentrated in the kidneys because they're --
 - Q. Excreted through the kidneys?
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And it turns out, you know, for people that take a lot of them, it takes a toll.
 - Q. So how much was he taking?

Α. We don't know.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

- Okay. So how do you know if it was enough to take a toll?
- 4 Α. I didn't. I didn't say it took a toll. I just said it was something he did that was marked in 6 his -- he had gout and he took NSAIDs, and it was remarked on in a couple of places in the chart.

So I don't know that -- I just know that he was taking NSAIDs, and that that is a risk factor for kidney disease.

- Well, you made a list (as read): Ο.
- 12 "Important among these" --
- 13 And you're talking about the risk factors for CKD? 14
- 15 Yeah. Α.
- 16 "Hyperuricemia" --Ο.
- 17 Α. Yeah.
- 18 Ο. (As read):
- "... NSAIDs, dyslipidemia and 19 20 atherosclerosis, obesity, and
- 21 diabetes."
- 22 Yeah. Α.
- 23 Okay. It is your view that diabetes was the 24 cause?
 - Α. I mean, my whole point in listing all these

risk factors was I wasn't going to attribute them to one cause. They're all risk factors for CKD.

- Q. You didn't include in your list exposure to chemicals nor the treatment for the cancer?
- A. Those aren't -- I mean, I didn't include them because, one, those are outside my area of expertise, but two, you don't find those in common lists of risk factors for CKD.

Now, common lists in textbooks or review articles don't include every single thing that's ever been connected to CKD, but they include all the major ones, and so did I.

- Q. Well, I appreciate that, but we're here about Mr. Keller as an individual person. You understand?
- A. Yeah, I do understand. I -- but I -- what I -- what I didn't come across, and what I really am not, I think, qualified to comment on, is toxicology. I mean, I have no idea what benzene does to eGFR. Just don't. But I know about these, and so I put in what I know about.

And I've told you -- you know, we've talked some about the stem cell transplant, and I've told you why my -- why I didn't think that was a -- proximal to his kidney failure.

Q. So being fair about this, and acknowledging

your expertise -- and I don't mean this in a bad way -- and the lack of expertise -- can't know everything about it --

> Α. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

- -- despite what Dr. Google tells us -- is that you could not fairly evaluate the contribution of chemicals nor the chemo or the stem cell -- the treatment for the cancer because that is simply just not something of which you have adequate knowledge to make an evaluation; is that right?
 - Yeah, so I would --Α.

Objection. Form. MR. KLOTZBUCHER:

THE WITNESS: I would say -- I would separate those two.

I can't comment on the chemical exposure, which is toxicology and well outside my expertise.

I am more confident about my opinion that his stem cell therapy treatment did not contribute meaningfully to his kidney disease. I can't say that's impossible, but I think the fact that he had relatively normal -- he had normal kidney function for three years after the treatment makes me think that that was a very low likelihood.

And then he has all these other risk factors on top, none of which I could attribute 10 percent,

show

1	15 percent, et cetera, but people that have those
2	exposures have an increased risk of CKD.
3	BY MR. MCGOWAN:
4	Q. Did Mr. Keller have normal kidney function
5	after the treatment? Or is there just no data to s

- A. He had normal creatinines, the same value he went into the hospital with before his stem cell treatment, on several occasions.
 - Q. I'm on page 8.

it was abnormal?

- A. Okay. Me too.
- Q. Top of it says (as read):

 "Susceptibility to end-organ
 complications varies among
 diabetic patients, with most of
 the variance determined by
 multiple genetic factors
 conferring different levels of
 susceptibility."
- A. Yeah.
- Q. Okay. Tell me what that has to do with Mr. Keller. Does he just have certain genetic makeup that makes him more likely to get CKD under the circumstances, whereas another patient might not?
 - A. Yeah, I mean, this was just trying to account

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

for the time course, the latency, and including all the things that contribute to his kidney disease.

That, as we talked about, some people progress rapidly and other people slowly. And we assume -- we know that this genetic risk -- we haven't found the genes yet -- there's genes that associate with diabetic nephropathy -- and we know that some of the susceptibility is heritable: that is, you can find it in families. And so that's where -- and then when I talk about most of the variance being genetic factors, if you do studies where you treat the blood sugar, treat the blood pressure, there's still a big explanatory part that's left over, and we attribute that to genetics.

But all I was saying here is that rates of development of type 2 diabetes vary among patients, but Mr. Keller followed sort of an average course, based on my assumption of when he got diabetes and what the progress was once he saw Dr. Leach.

- Q. Does diabetes -- or high blood sugar,
 I guess, cause kidney disease more frequently than
 uncontrolled hypertension?
- A. I mean, uncontrolled hypertension is a continuous variable, too. I mean, people that have really high blood pressures can have acute damage that

Page 84 1 is -- that progresses really quickly. But to say, you know, one is worse than the other is hard. 2 3 I mean, hypertension can cause chronic kidney 4 disease? No question. 5 Α. I think Barry White died of that --6 Ο. 7 (Over-speaking.) 8 Α. Yeah. 9 Q. -- a lot of people do, I guess? 10 Yeah. Α. 11 And diabetes can cause kidney disease. And Ο. 12 frequently people that have one have the other? 13 All true. Α. 14 Okay. All right. Ο. 15 What's going to happen now is I'm going to 16 take probably five minutes, go over my notes --17 Α. Okay. 18

- Ο. -- and then we'll go from there.
- 19 Yeah. Terrific. Α.
- 20 MR. MCGOWAN: Thanks.
- 21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record at
- 10:42 a.m. 22
- 23 (Recess taken from 10:42 a.m. to 10:57 a.m.)
- 24 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: On the record at
- 2.5 10:57 a.m.

BY MR. MCGOWAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

Q. All right, Doctor. Is there any other answer that you want to explain further, that I may have cut you off on? Anything else that's germane to my questions that you want to say that I didn't give you the chance to?

A. No.

MR. MCGOWAN: All right. Well, that's all I have for you, Doctor. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANTS BY MR. KLOTZBUCHER:

- Q. I have just a few questions, Dr. D'Alessio.

 In your practice, you've treated patients
 who have had NHL -- non-Hodgkin's lymphoma treatment?
- A. I'd have trouble -- I've seen patients that have had lymphoma in the past and been treated for it. I've seen patients in the hospital who are undergoing stem cell treatments -- and I've done consults on them as well, yeah. But -- no, I think that's true. But it's -- the lymphoma part is always background to me. I'm always involved to focus on an endocrine problem on top of that.
- Q. I understand. So it's -- you're part of a care team --

|--|

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. -- or it's part of the patient's medical history?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Did you review the drugs Mr. Keller took when you reviewed his records? The --
- A. Yeah.
- Q. I'll rephrase. The drugs that he took regarding his NHL treatment?

(Court reporter asks for clarification.)

A. So I looked through the -- you know, I looked through -- in Walla Walla, Dr. Iacoboni gave him what's called CHOP -- C-H-O-P -- or CHOP-R -- something like that -- and that's something I remember from my residency. They used to use CHOP. "CHOP till you drop," we used to say. And -- you know, so I know Cytoxan and Vincristine and those.

And then I think he got Adriamycin and etoposide after his radiation. So I've heard of those drugs too.

- Q. Did you review whether those drugs were toxic to the kidneys?
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. Are those drugs toxic to the kidneys?
 - A. He got -- and one of the other experts wrote

	Page 87
1	that he got vancomycin. That's an antibiotic that's a
2	nephrotoxin.
3	And to on the search I did, which was
4	just a quick internet search, I couldn't find
5	nephrotoxicity to the other chemotherapies. But
6	again, not my area of expertise.
7	MR. KLOTZBUCHER: Understood.
8	I have nothing further. Thank you for your
9	time, Doctor. I appreciate it.
10	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
11	MR. MCGOWAN: Thanks, Doctor.
12	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
13	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record at
14	11:00 a.m. This concludes the deposition of David
15	D'Alessio.
16	(Whereupon, at 11:00 a.m., the deposition ceased.
17	Signature was reserved.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 88 ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT I, DAVID A. D'ALESSIO, M.D., do hereby acknowledge that I have read and examined the foregoing testimony, and the same is a true, correct, and complete transcription of the testimony given by me, and any corrections appear on the attached errata sheet signed by me. (DATE) (SIGNATURE)

			Page 89
1		ERRATA	A
2	CASE NAME:	IN RE: CAMP LEJEUNE	WATER LITIGATION
3	WITNESS NAME	: DAVID A. D'ALESSI	IO, M.D.
4		7:23-CV-897	
5	PAGE LINE	READS	SHOULD READ
6			5
7			
8			
9			
.0			
.1			
.2			
.3			
_4			
.5			
-6			
.7			
.8			
.9			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	(DATE)		(SIGNATURE)

	Page 90
1	STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)
) CERTIFICATE
2	COUNTY OF ORANGE)
3	I, Sophie Brock, Registered Diplomate
4	Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, and Notary Public
5	of North Carolina, the officer before whom the foregoing
6	proceeding was conducted, do hereby certify that the
7	witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing
8	proceeding was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of
9	said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability
10	and thereafter transcribed under my supervision; and
11	that the foregoing pages, inclusive, constitute a true
12	and accurate transcription of the testimony of the
13	witness.
L 4	I do further certify that I am neither counsel
15	for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
16	this action, and further, that I am not a relative or
17	employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the
18	parties thereof, nor financially or otherwise interested
19	in the outcome of said action.
20	This, the 7th day of July, 2025.
21	
22	Sophie Brock
23	Samue Stock
24	
	Sophie Brock, RDR, CRR
25	Notary Number: 200834000001

[& - 3a] Page 1

	440 45 45	60 44 64 44	AF 0 F 0 A
&	140 45:15	60:11 61:14	250 72:24
& 2:3,7	46:18	2004 57:18	25th 4:4
1	14117 90:23	2008 12:15	26 70:23
	15 27:7 53:5	61:11	27 56:10 71:5
1 16:13,20 50:5	71:21 82:1	200834000001	71:12,14
50:6 51:16	1539 2:3	90:25	27701 1:12
67:11,11,12	170 73:1	2009 46:24	29 70:21
1,000 59:11	18 70:14	63:3	29732 2:4
1-2 16:23	180 73:1	2012 16:9	3
1.1 56:18	186 45:8,13	17:22 23:17	
1.3 56:18	46:6 49:13	44:7 47:3,12	3 16:9,12,23
1.4 14:21 15:8	1998 12:18	49:12 57:6,7	17:21 24:23
57:2,23 58:24	49:12	57:18,25 59:1	25:22 44:6
1.4. 15:5 56:11	1999 44:10	59:24 60:12	47:12,15 49:19
1.5. 15:8	46:19	63:8 74:2,8	50:15,17 57:10
1.8 58:21	1s 50:19	2012/2013	57:12,25 58:25
1.9 58:21	2	67:16	59:16,24 74:8
10 66:4,19		2013 14:11	3,000 7:10
81:25	2 16:13,20	47:8 60:7	3,500 7:5
10,000 51:5	24:14 39:14,17	69:14 70:1,2	30 10:11 39:16
10.7 67:18	46:24 50:10	2018 68:23	39:22 70:23
10.7. 67:17	54:5 61:6,11	2019 70:21	71:10,12
100 35:17	61:21 63:2	201 70.21 202 2:19	30/30/30 10:21
10:04 55:2,4	64:15 76:7	202 2.19 2022 71:4	30/30/60 10:22
10:42 84:22,23	83:16	2022 71.4 2023 15:17	3011 2:8
10:57 84:23,25	20 28:19 46:14		307-1024 2:19
1100 2:17	72:24,25	56:11 67:3	31 71:14
1100 2:17 111 2:12	200 45:16	2024 32:12	313 2:9
11:00 87:14,16	2000 15:2	2025 1:13 4:4	32 66:2,14,18
12 27:7 43:8,9	20005 2:18	90:20	69:12,13,23
12 ,000 7:11	2000s 14:22	2028 69:11	70:1
12,000 7.11 12.9 63:22	2001 39:3	20s 72:8	327-7800 2:4
13 63:14 65:8	2003 15:4	24th 2:8	3a 16:23
70:13	23:17 56:20	25 1:12	

[3b - acute] Page 2

3b 16:23	7	99 40:12	absorb 20:25
4	7 41:23,24 42:8	9:58 55:1,2	accelerated
4 3:3 16:23	42:11,12,15,15	9th 47:8	51:12
56:10 61:14	43:9,10 48:12	a	accepted 41:16
65:21 71:12	48:22,25 51:3	a.m. 1:13 4:4	account 82:25
40 24:14 39:14	63:12,16,20,21	55:1,2,2,4	accrued 7:12
39:16,22	78:7	84:22,23,23,25	accurate 90:12
4054 2:18	7.1 63:22	87:14,16	accurately
45 64:12 70:2	70 10:14	a1c 41:16,21,22	59:21
48202 2:8	75 45:14 76:6	42:1,8,8 43:7	acid 24:20 47:6
5	78701 2:12	47:3,8,9,22,22	66:2,12,16,19
	7:23 1:2 89:4	48:17 60:6	66:21,23 72:1
5 61:14 63:1	7th 90:20	63:8,20 67:16	acknowledge
65:22	8	67:20 68:9	88:3
5.8 42:8	8 63:12 72:6	ability 90:9	acknowledging
50 9:4 34:3,10 35:16 42:17	82:10	able 18:25	80:25
71:21 76:7	8.6 47:9 60:6	37:25 39:8	acknowledg
500 2:12	80 34:19	abnormal 21:8	88:1
50s 64:9	800 1:11	26:11 82:6	acted 7:25
512 2:13	800-4170 2:9	abnormalities	action 78:17
555 1:11	803 2:4	21:12 38:18	90:16,19 active 12:21
6	80s 64:11,24	50:23	
	85 3:4	abnormality	58:23 acts 64:6
6 42:11 70:20	897 1:2 89:4	21:16 26:9	actual 12:23
73:23	8:58 1:13 4:4	28:22 36:7	13:4,9 27:15
6.5 42:11	9	above 1:9 15:6	47:21 49:11
6.5. 42:11	_	47:3 63:8	75:1
60 16:21 76:8	9 12:15 41:22	absence 17:5	actually 42:18
600 7:5	42:12,16 61:11 90 16:20 34:19	absolute 22:18	52:15 65:2,22
690-0990 2:13	95 34:8 35:16	absolutely	67:8
6:00 15:20	98 12:22	30:10 42:6	acute 72:8
	70 12.22	51:14	83:25

[add - attached] Page 3

		I	
add 24:10	ago 63:14	38:12,14 39:24	area 26:14 30:2
52:25 74:9	64:12 65:8	52:9 54:8 58:3	30:19,24 80:6
addition 23:21	agree 12:2	59:3 75:11	87:6
address 33:5,5	30:25 37:22	85:2	arthritis 24:18
33:10	53:7	answering	66:25
addressed	alerts 70:7	32:22	articles 80:10
32:24	alike 74:21	anti 78:17	asked 32:4 62:5
adds 53:2	allcomers 9:7	antibiotic 87:1	asking 31:16,17
adequate 81:9	allison 2:21	anybody 46:4	69:5
adequately	4:13	54:3,9,11	asks 86:10
65:17	allison.oleary	anybody's 18:9	aspiration
administrative	2:21	anymore 10:1	66:10
9:15,18 10:15	allow 27:13	73:5,14	assistance 56:4
10:18,22	allowed 27:11	anytime 24:12	associate 83:6
admissible	alluded 63:17	54:21	association
27:14	67:9	apologize 4:24	43:16 52:23
adrenal 8:25	america 2:16	20:21	assume 16:13
adriamycin	4:6	apparent 60:4	40:17 83:4
14:3 86:18	amount 19:6	apparently	assumed 63:20
advance 4:24	20:25 73:1,7	78:13	63:21
affect 41:11,11	amounts 73:4	appear 70:2	assuming 49:18
affecting 26:25	analogy 27:22	88:6	49:23 50:18
30:5	analysis 9:20	appears 72:10	assumption
affects 43:22	animals 43:21	90:7	43:3 49:21
52:15	answer 5:6	appreciate	52:4 83:18
affirmed 4:16	11:9 12:13	11:19 20:20	assumptions
afghanistan	14:1 15:13	23:25 80:13	20:1,2
62:7	17:3,24 21:6	87:9	ate 45:20
afternoon 9:16	21:24 23:6	approaching	atherosclerosis
9:19,23	24:5 25:10	73:10	53:21 76:2,17
age 16:18 28:19	27:3 28:11	april 15:2	79:20
63:15	29:8,17 30:8	arbitrariness	atrophy 74:24
aggressive 36:6	31:21 32:10	71:11	attached 19:21
41:21	33:15,17 37:16		88:6

Golkow Technologies, A Veritext Division

Page 94 of 123

attorney 90:17 83:18 72:1 50:24 51:17 attribute 44:17 bash 2:13 big 14:19 61:18 53:22 65:13,17 80:1 81:25 basic 48:14 69:18 76:1 71:1 72:17 83:13 61:25 62:3,15 83:12 83:11,12,20,25 attributing 76:20 billing 7:8 blvd 2:8 72:21 basically 15:10 bills 7:5 board 10:24 august 70:2 18:20 53:17,23 biomarker body 16:18 austin 2:12 78:4,9 biomarkers bone 41:9 boost 64:17 average 83:17 basis 39:5 51:2 19:21 boost 64:17 b beginning 38:6 74:25 70:12 67:14 borderline 65:2 back 7:20 57:16,24 behalf 1:10 2:2 22:2 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 bouncing 71:7 backdate 59:22 belief				
attribute 44:17 bash 2:13 big 14:19 61:18 53:22 65:13,17 80:1 81:25 basic 48:14 69:18 76:1 71:1 72:17 83:13 61:25 62:3,15 83:12 83:11,12,20,25 attributing 76:20 billing 7:8 blvd 2:8 72:21 basically 15:10 billing 7:8 blvd 2:8 august 70:2 18:20 53:17,23 biomarker body 16:18 austin 2:12 78:4,9 biomarkers bone 41:9 average 83:17 basis 39:5 51:2 19:21 boost 64:17 aware 13:8,22 77:2,3,4 biopsies 19:25 67:14 borderline 65:2 back 7:20 57:16,24 behalf 1:10 2:2 20:2 21:10,12 22:18 22:19 25:25 backdate 59:22 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 54:19,20 55:6 background 85:21 bell <th>attention 47:4</th> <th>61:20 67:10</th> <th>bicarbonate</th> <th>49:11,19 50:13</th>	attention 47:4	61:20 67:10	bicarbonate	49:11,19 50:13
80:1 81:25 basic 48:14 69:18 76:1 71:1 72:17 83:13 61:25 62:3,15 83:12 83:11,12,20,25 attributing 76:20 billing 7:8 blvd 2:8 72:21 basically 15:10 bills 7:5 bloard 10:24 august 70:2 18:20 53:17,23 biomarker body 16:18 austin 2:12 57:6 69:6,7 26:10 72:23,25 average 83:17 basis 39:5 51:2 19:21 bone 41:9 average 83:17 basis 39:5 51:2 19:21 boost 64:17 55:15,16 beat 76:15 beginning 38:6 74:25 bone 41:9 best 7:20 57:16,24 behalf 1:10 2:2 20:2 21:10,12 20:2 21:10,12 22:18 22:19 25:25 belief 38:20 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 5:16 54:19,20 55:6 break 5:16 54:19,20 55:6 break 5:16 54:19,20 55:6 bred 41:9 broadly 8:22 54:12,16 broadly 8:22 54:12,16 brock 1:13 90:3 90:24 brock 1:13 90:3 90:24 bronchitis 44:10	attorney 90:17	83:18	72:1	50:24 51:17
83:13 61:25 62:3,15 83:12 83:11,12,20,25 attributing 76:20 basically 15:10 billing 7:8 blud 2:8 basically 15:10 billing 7:8 blud 2:8 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 board 10:24 boost 64:17 57:16,24 biopsis 19:25 both colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">both colspan="3">colspan="3">both colspan="3">both col	attribute 44:17	bash 2:13	big 14:19 61:18	53:22 65:13,17
attributing 76:20 billing 7:8 blvd 2:8 august 70:2 18:20 53:17,23 bills 7:5 board 10:24 austin 2:12 57:6 69:6,7 26:10 72:23,25 avenue 2:12 78:4,9 biomarkers bone 41:9 average 83:17 basis 39:5 51:2 19:21 boost 64:17 aware 13:8,22 77:2,3,4 biopsies 19:25 67:14 beat 76:15 beginning 38:6 74:25 bottom 22:18 55:15,16 behalf 1:10 2:2 20:22 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 bottom 22:18 22:18 22:19 25:25 behalf 1:10 2:2 22:8 26:8 22:19 25:25 believe 12:9 16:24 44:7 25:23 49:3 54:19,20 55:6 belleve 12:9 16:24 44:7 25:23 49:3 54:12,16 24:12,16 backwards 57:18 29:23 36:24 16:1,17 18:12 29:24	80:1 81:25	basic 48:14	69:18 76:1	71:1 72:17
72:21 basically 15:10 bills 7:5 board 10:24 august 70:2 18:20 53:17,23 biomarker body 16:18 austin 2:12 57:6 69:6,7 26:10 72:23,25 avenue 2:12 78:4,9 biomarkers bone 41:9 average 83:17 basis 39:5 51:2 19:21 boost 64:17 aware 13:8,22 77:2,3,4 biopsies 19:25 67:14 borderline 65:2 back 7:20 57:16,24 behalf 1:10 2:2 20:2 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 bouncing 71:7 28:15 55:6 63:13 64:9 69:7,22 6elief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 54:19,20 55:6 bred 41:9 backdate 59:22 believe 12:9 16:24 44:7 25:23 49:3 71:3 74:12 broadly 8:22 54:12,16 brock 1:13 90:3 90:24 brock 1:13 90:3 90:24 brochitis 42:10	83:13	61:25 62:3,15	83:12	83:11,12,20,25
august 70:2 18:20 53:17,23 biomarker body 16:18 avenue 2:12 78:4,9 biomarkers bone 41:9 average 83:17 basis 39:5 51:2 19:21 boost 64:17 aware 13:8,22 77:2,3,4 biopsies 19:25 67:14 back 7:20 20:10 21:16 borderline 65:2 bealf 1:10 2:2 20:2 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 25:16 20:2 28 26:8 bouncing 71:7 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 51:6 believe 12:9 16:24 44:7 25:23 49:3 54:19,20 55:6 break 57:18 bell 29:23,24 blocking 62:3 bad 15:10 41:7 29:23 36:24 16:1,17 18:12 90:24 brock 1:13 78:13 80:18 22:25 35:1 44:10	attributing	76:20	billing 7:8	blvd 2:8
austin 2:12 57:6 69:6,7 26:10 72:23,25 avenue 2:12 78:4,9 biomarkers bone 41:9 average 83:17 basis 39:5 51:2 19:21 boost 64:17 b beat 76:15 20:10 21:16 borderline 65:2 b beginning 38:6 74:25 70:12 bottom 22:18 back 7:20 57:16,24 biopsy 19:20 bottom 22:18 28:15 55:6 63:13 64:9 69:7,22 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 5:16 believe 12:9 bit 9:8 15:19 54:19,20 55:6 bred 41:9 background 85:21 backwards 75:22 blocking 62:3 brock 1:13 90:3 bad 15:10 41:7 29:23 36:24 16:1,17 18:12 brock 1:13 90:3 71:13 78:13 80:18 22:25 35:1 bronchitis	72:21	basically 15:10	bills 7:5	board 10:24
avenue 2:12 78:4,9 biomarkers bone 41:9 average 83:17 basis 39:5 51:2 19:21 boost 64:17 aware 13:8,22 77:2,3,4 biopsies 19:25 67:14 b beat 76:15 20:10 21:16 borderline 65:2 back 7:20 57:16,24 biopsy 19:20 bottom 22:18 28:15 55:6 belief 1:10 2:2 20:2 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 bouncing 71:7 69:7,22 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 5:16 54:19,20 55:6 break 5:16 54:12,16 broadly 8:22 54:12,16 brock 1:13 90:3 90:24 brock 1:13 90:3 <th>august 70:2</th> <td>18:20 53:17,23</td> <td>biomarker</td> <td>body 16:18</td>	august 70:2	18:20 53:17,23	biomarker	body 16:18
average 83:17 basis 39:5 51:2 19:21 boost 64:17 55:15,16 beat 76:15 20:10 21:16 borderline 65:2 back 7:20 beginning 38:6 74:25 70:12 behalf 1:10 2:2 20:2 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 5:16 backdate 59:22 believe 12:9 bit 9:8 15:19 54:19,20 55:6 background 85:21 bell 29:23,24 blood 15:25 broadly 8:22 backwards 57:18 bell 29:23,36:24 16:1,17 18:12 90:24 bad 15:10 41:7 29:23 36:24 18:21 20:11 bronchitis 71:13 78:13 80:18 22:25 35:1 44:10	austin 2:12	57:6 69:6,7	26:10	72:23,25
aware 13:8,22 77:2,3,4 biopsies 19:25 67:14 b beat 76:15 20:10 21:16 borderline 65:2 back 7:20 57:16,24 biopsy 19:20 bottom 22:18 12:25 20:13 28:15 55:6 behalf 1:10 2:2 20:2 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 28:15 55:6 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 5:16 69:7,22 believe 12:9 bit 9:8 15:19 54:19,20 55:6 background 85:21 bell 29:23,24 blocking 62:3 break 41:9 backwards 57:18 bell 29:23,36:24 16:1,17 18:12 90:24 bad 15:10 41:7 29:23 36:24 18:21 20:11 bronchitis 71:13 78:13 80:18 22:25 35:1 44:10	avenue 2:12	78:4,9	biomarkers	bone 41:9
b beat 76:15 20:10 21:16 borderline 65:2 back 7:20 57:16,24 biopsy 19:20 bottom 22:18 12:25 20:13 28:15 55:6 20:2 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 22:19 25:25 63:13 64:9 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 5:16 69:7,22 backdate 59:22 believe 12:9 16:24 44:7 25:23 49:3 bred 41:9 background 75:22 bell 29:23,24 blood 15:25 brock 1:13 90:3 57:18 29:23 36:24 16:1,17 18:12 90:24 bronchitis 57:18 29:23 36:24 18:21 20:11 bronchitis 57:13 29:23 36:24 22:25 35:1 44:10	average 83:17	basis 39:5 51:2	19:21	boost 64:17
b beginning 38:6 74:25 70:12 back 7:20 57:16,24 biopsy 19:20 bottom 22:18 12:25 20:13 28:15 55:6 22:16 20:2 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 63:13 64:9 69:7,22 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 5:16 believe 12:9 16:24 44:7 25:23 49:3 54:19,20 55:6 bred 41:9 background 75:22 blocking 62:3 broadly 8:22 backwards 57:18 bell 29:23,24 blood 15:25 brock 1:13 90:3 bad 15:10 41:7 29:23 36:24 18:21 20:11 bronchitis 71:13 78:13 80:18 22:25 35:1 44:10	aware 13:8,22	77:2,3,4	biopsies 19:25	67:14
back 7:20 57:16,24 biopsy 19:20 bottom 22:18 12:25 20:13 28:15 55:6 20:2 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 63:13 64:9 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 5:16 believe 12:9 bit 9:8 15:19 54:19,20 55:6 backdate 59:22 62:8 68:1 71:3 74:12 break 5:16 background 85:21 54:19,20 55:6 54:19,20 55:6 bell 29:23,24 blocking 62:3 62:3 54:12,16 backwards 57:18 59:23 36:24 16:1,17 18:12 90:24 bad 15:10 41:7 80:18 22:25 35:1 44:10	55:15,16	beat 76:15	20:10 21:16	borderline 65:2
back 7:20 12:25 20:13 28:15 55:6 63:13 64:9 belief 38:20 69:7,22 believe 12:9 backdate 59:22 believe 12:9 background 62:8 68:1 71:3 74:12 54:19,20 55:6 bell 29:23,24 blocking 62:3 backwards 57:18 benzene 29:19 29:23 36:24 16:1,17 18:12 90:24 18:21 20:11 22:25 35:1 44:10	b	beginning	38:6 74:25	70:12
12:25 20:13 28:15 55:6 22:16 20:2 21:10,12 22:19 25:25 63:13 64:9 69:7,22 22:16 38:17 74:12 22:19 25:25 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 38:17 74:12 38:19 20 38:19 20 38:19 20 38:19 20 38:19 20:11 38:19 20 38:19 20 38:19 20 38:19 20 38:19 20 38:19 20 38:19 20 38:19 20:11 38:19 20:11 38:19 20:11 38:19 20:21	hack 7:20	57:16,24	biopsy 19:20	bottom 22:18
28:15 55:6 63:13 64:9 69:7,22 backdate 59:22 background 85:21 backwards 57:18 bad 15:10 41:7 71:13 78:13		behalf 1:10 2:2	20:2 21:10,12	22:19 25:25
63:13 64:9 belief 38:20 38:17 74:12 break 5:16 69:7,22 believe 12:9 bit 9:8 15:19 54:19,20 55:6 backdate 59:22 16:24 44:7 25:23 49:3 bred 41:9 background 85:21 75:22 blocking 62:3 broadly 8:22 bell 29:23,24 blood 15:25 brock 1:13 90:3 bad 15:10 41:7 29:23 36:24 18:21 20:11 90:24 80:18 22:25 35:1 44:10		2:16	22:8 26:8	bouncing 71:7
69:7,22 believe 12:9 bit 9:8 15:19 54:19,20 55:6 backdate 59:22 16:24 44:7 25:23 49:3 bred 41:9 background 75:22 blocking 62:3 54:19,20 55:6 broadly 8:22 54:12,16 54:12,16 brock 1:13 90:3 1:13 90:3 bad 15:10 41:7 29:23 36:24 18:21 20:11 bronchitis 71:13 78:13 80:18 22:25 35:1 44:10		belief 38:20	38:17 74:12	break 5:16
backdate 59:22 16:24 44:7 25:23 49:3 bred 41:9 background 62:8 68:1 71:3 74:12 broadly 8:22 backwards 57:18 bell 29:23,24 blood 15:25 brock 1:13 90:3 bad 15:10 41:7 29:23 36:24 18:21 20:11 bronchitis 71:13 78:13 44:10		believe 12:9	bit 9:8 15:19	54:19,20 55:6
background 62:8 68:1 71:3 74:12 broadly 8:22 backwards bell 29:23,24 blood 15:25 brock 1:13 90:3 bad 15:10 41:7 29:23 36:24 18:21 20:11 bronchitis 71:3 78:13 44:10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	16:24 44:7	25:23 49:3	bred 41:9
85:21 backwards 57:18 bad 15:10 41:7 71:13 78:13 75:22 blocking 62:3 54:12,16 brock 1:13 90:3		62:8 68:1	71:3 74:12	broadly 8:22
backwards bell 29:23,24 blood 15:25 brock 1:13 90:3 57:18 benzene 29:19 16:1,17 18:12 90:24 bad 15:10 41:7 80:18 18:21 20:11 bronchitis 22:25 35:1 44:10		75:22	blocking 62:3	54:12,16
57:18 bad 15:10 41:7 71:13 78:13 benzene 29:19 29:23 36:24 80:18 16:1,17 18:12 18:21 20:11 22:25 35:1 44:10		bell 29:23,24	blood 15:25	brock 1:13 90:3
bad 15:10 41:7 29:23 36:24 18:21 20:11 bronchitis 71:13 78:13 80:18 22:25 35:1 44:10		benzene 29:19	16:1,17 18:12	90:24
71:13 78:13 80:18 22:25 35:1 44:10		29:23 36:24	18:21 20:11	bronchitis
host 5.1 6 49.24 40.5 11 12 host 42.0		80:18	22:25 35:1	44:10
81:1 Dest 5:1,6 48:24 40:5,11,12 Duck 45:9		best 5:1,6 48:24	40:5,11,12	buck 43:9
bang 43:9 90:9 41:5,6,12 42:6 bucks 56:23		90:9	41:5,6,12 42:6	bucks 56:23
barry 84:6 better 18:19 42:14 43:13 building 2:7		better 18:19	42:14 43:13	building 2:7
based 20:2 22:6 40:6 42:11,11 44:1,5,9,11,15 bunch 21:10		40:6 42:11,11	44:1,5,9,11,15	bunch 21:10
33:17 34:24 42:12,15,17 45:6,16 46:11 50:13		42:12,15,17	45:6,16 46:11	50:13
35:23 49:21 43:6 68:10,18 46:18,22 47:14 burden 49:6		43:6 68:10,18	46:18,22 47:14	burden 49:6
58:11 59:23 70:13 47:18,18,22 business 37:5		70:13	47:18,18,22	business 37:5
48:6,8,9,11	50.11 57.25		48:6,8,9,11	

С	carolina 1:1,12	caused 21:19	cetera 20:12,15
c 2:1 4:1 86:13	1:15 2:4 6:15	74:10	82:1
90:1,1	90:1,5	causes 16:6	chad 2:5 4:10
calculated	case 4:5 5:13	18:9,21,21	4:20
16:16	6:2,13 8:8	24:22 35:3	challenge 20:17
calculation	13:10 16:25	41:1 43:13	44:23
61:10	21:21 25:19	52:14,14	challenges
calculations	32:3,17 33:1	causing 28:8	22:10
30:23	33:21 34:5	53:19	chance 5:4 85:6
call 28:2 47:21	35:13 40:17	ceased 87:16	change 22:2
48:7 50:8	60:24 75:23	cell 13:7,17	67:23
77:13 78:11	89:2,4	22:5,13,24	changed 56:21
called 67:10	cases 6:4,7,8,13	23:11 31:9	67:25
76:10 86:13	8:7 16:22	35:24 36:6,11	chart 47:16
camp 1:4 4:5	cat 26:9	36:17 39:9	79:7
6:18 29:14	causation	54:5 55:9	cheap 64:19
89:2	25:22	77:23 80:22	checked 51:1
cancer 22:3	cause 14:3 18:5	81:7,18 82:8	chem 48:12
36:6 75:9,17	18:7,15 20:7	85:19	51:3
77:20 80:4	22:16 23:21	cells 18:16,16	chemical 55:8
81:8	24:8 25:20	18:22 24:24	81:15
cardiac 13:24	31:1,13 32:11	25:7 28:2,17	chemicals
14:3 76:13	32:14 33:3,7	30:1 37:8,13	29:13 30:1,15
cardiologist	33:12 34:2,9	38:3,22 39:2	30:25 31:7
11:6	34:13,18 37:14	43:21 52:16	36:1,4 37:6
cardiomyopa	38:10 40:21	74:20 77:7	80:4 81:7
76:14	44:14 49:24	certain 19:6	chemistry
care 2:3 41:20	52:6,13 53:11	41:8 82:22	48:14
41:21,22 48:7	53:13 60:17	certainly 22:23	chemo 21:19
49:13 61:25	66:18 74:15	70:13 76:6	22:24 25:3
64:23 65:5	75:1 76:4,25	certified 1:14	54:4 55:9 81:7
67:15 68:5,16	79:24 80:2	90:4	chemotherap
85:25	83:21 84:3,11	certify 90:6,14	13:18

	- 404		
chemotherapi	clarification	81:15	condition 9:6
14:4 87:5	86:10	common 15:16	conditions
chemotherapy	class 64:9	15:18,23 16:17	18:19
11:7 13:2,6,9	classroom 10:1	18:7 22:10	conducted 90:6
13:13 14:15	10:2	24:22 35:3	conferences
24:25 25:13	clear 13:20	43:4 64:20	9:23
31:8 35:18,24	20:5 52:5	65:5,8 68:3	conferring
76:23	clearance	80:7,9	82:18
chicken 60:24	19:15	commonly	confident 12:6
cholesterol 9:1	cleared 73:4	22:16	42:13 81:17
53:16	clearly 74:3	communicating	conflating
choose 58:15	clinic 9:5,16,21	5:9	28:14
chop 13:11,13	9:22 10:3,4,9	company 52:23	confounders
86:13,13,15,15	20:13 74:5	compensate	53:4
chronic 14:11	clinical 10:12	19:10	confused 72:2
14:12 16:9,14	17:6 31:19	compiled 55:18	congratulations
17:21 18:9	32:5 41:20	complete 11:16	73:13
19:16 20:3	42:7 59:23	88:4	congress 2:12
22:16 34:22	66:8,11 72:4	completely	connect 57:20
49:19 59:13	clinically 59:14	37:12	58:5
74:1,18 84:3	60:4	complication	connected
chronically	clinics 62:8	68:25 72:18	58:14,25 80:11
41:17	cmcgowan 2:5	complications	consequence
circumstances	coexist 23:1,2,8	41:8 43:5 49:1	29:3
82:24	colon 77:20	82:14	consequences
ckd 18:18	combination	concentrated	28:23
51:10 53:2,14	13:1 55:8	78:19	consider 8:17
58:25 59:16	combine 54:15	concerns 5:23	11:2 24:13
60:10 71:11	come 9:4 10:9	concluded	considered
74:8 76:8,25	20:13 68:8,13	12:19 30:11	11:13 42:9
79:14 80:2,8	69:22 80:16	concludes	45:15 77:14
80:11 82:2,23	comes 52:22	87:14	constitute
claim 8:9	comment 47:1	conclusion 15:9	90:11
	54:1 80:17	35:20 58:13	

[consults - dead] Page 7

consults 85:19 contacted 6:3,3 6:6,21 contaminants 30:5 contamination	corrected 14:16 corrections 88:6 correctly 63:17 corrects 16:18 counsel 4:8,18	crr 90:24 crystallized 66:20 curious 61:24 current 64:22 curve 43:11	damaging 78:18 damn 11:17 dangerous 71:25 data 9:19 12:14
33:7 continuing 67:21 continuous 71:15 83:24 contribute 81:18 83:2 contributed 39:4 60:20 76:4 contributing 21:21 22:22 23:20,20 33:7 33:12 40:21 contribution 35:17 53:13 55:20 75:8 81:6 contributors 31:11 control 48:19 controlled 41:2 42:1,2 72:18 copy 5:12 corey 2:25 correct 27:13	54:17 85:11 90:14,17 counseling 39:17 county 90:2 couple 13:18 42:13 72:19 79:7 course 15:21 28:13 32:5 35:5 57:12 59:16 61:15 70:15 83:1,17 court 1:1 4:9 86:10 covered 74:6 creatinine 14:13,15,21 15:3,4,18,21,24 16:16,19 19:7 19:14 20:14,15 26:2 36:11 56:11,16 creatinines 50:23 82:7 credit 40:20	cut 85:3 cv 1:2 89:4 cytoxan 86:17 d 4:1 d'alessio 1:7 4:7,15,21,22 85:13 87:15 88:2 89:3 d.c. 2:18 damage 18:15 19:7,11,14,19 19:22 20:3,6 20:23 21:8,13 21:15,19 22:8 22:23,24 24:12 25:12,15 26:1 26:6,8,12,13 28:16,21 29:1 30:12 31:1 36:21 37:7,23 37:24 38:2,4,7 38:9 39:3 53:21 83:25 damaged 18:17 37:8 38:16,21	20:2 21:9 38:15 43:3 47:14 50:19 52:4 53:1 57:5 57:19,25 58:12 59:24,25 60:2 60:23 62:2 70:19 77:12 82:5 database 61:2 dataset 21:13 date 4:3 12:9 88:10 89:25 dating 46:24 63:2 david 1:7 4:7 4:15 87:14 88:2 89:3 day 7:6 9:2,2 9:14,17 28:17 28:17 58:19,19 64:19 70:6,6 90:20 days 14:14 dead 28:2,6,17
66:17 88:4	cross 85:11	39:2 43:20	37:8,13 74:19

[decide - disease] Page 8

decide 24:24	deposed 5:2 6:7	61:7,11,16,21	72:7
decision 72:4	deposition 1:7	62:15,22 63:2	diana 2:9
declined 66:1	1:9 8:13 18:23	64:10,15 65:2	die 76:7,8
76:21	87:14,16	68:15 73:2,11	died 84:6
declines 28:19	despite 81:5	73:13 74:9	diet 68:10
decrease 41:4	detailed 54:10	75:25 76:7	difference
65:18	details 13:20	78:5 79:21,23	69:18 70:3
decreased	determined	83:16,18,20	71:14
20:16 65:14	82:16	84:11	differences
deep 21:13	detroit 2:8	diabetic 9:3	69:17
defendant 2:16	developed 23:9	35:13 41:8	different 19:23
defendants	35:9	42:1,20 43:4,4	20:3 33:20
85:11	developing	46:11 61:25	39:1 82:18
defense 4:12	51:9	65:18 69:4	differential
deficit 25:14	development	72:11 73:9	22:18
define 45:25	42:19 53:14	76:14 82:15	difficult 21:5
defined 16:15	83:16	83:6	diplomate 1:14
26:8	develops 24:23	diabetics 39:15	90:3
definitely 41:12	dgjonaj 2:10	diagnosed	dipstick 62:16
degeneration	diabetes 9:1,5,9	57:10 59:1	direct 53:11
68:25 69:8	12:11 18:5,19	61:6 62:20	director 9:18
degraded 67:12	22:25 23:10,14	66:10	discharge
dehydrated	23:16 24:15	diagnoses 21:3	22:13
16:2	31:12 32:7	60:10	discharged
dehydration	34:25 35:10	diagnosis 12:11	14:17
15:19,22	39:11,18 40:25	12:17 16:10	discovered
delicate 18:16	41:1,2 44:20	44:6 46:23	46:13
18:22	44:24 45:2,17	47:11,15,17	discuss 75:14
department	46:18,24 47:17	49:19 61:11	75:18
2:17 32:25	48:19 50:5,8	63:2 69:9	discussed 26:5
depends 15:7	50:10,11 52:6	diagnostic	disease 14:12
deponent 4:7	52:25 54:5	48:18 49:16	16:10,14,25
88:1	55:9 60:5,11	dialysis 32:12	17:21 18:6,10
1	33.9 00.3,11	dialysis 32.12	17.21 10.0,10

			,
22:16 24:23	56:23 59:5	drive 2:3	29:25 31:6,9
25:22 33:4	64:23 68:18	drop 69:21	35:25
35:4,10 39:4	70:9 85:2,9	86:16	effective 68:16
39:13,19 40:3	87:9,11	drug 20:12	egfr 14:13
40:7 41:13,18	doctor's 70:7	21:11 64:20	16:15,18 19:15
41:25 42:3,16	doctors 62:7,23	65:5 67:6	70:14 71:20
42:20,25 43:5	68:5	drugs 13:13	80:18
43:5 47:12,15	document 63:4	14:3 25:18	egfrs 72:6,7
49:20 50:16	documentation	42:5 51:23	egg 60:24
52:7,13 53:11	62:9	64:9,10,13	eight 50:16,17
53:20 54:6	documented	65:3 86:5,8,20	57:13 59:17,19
55:13,20 57:13	24:8 61:5 74:3	86:21,24	either 33:17,17
58:23 59:14	doing 19:25	due 25:5	36:22 57:2
60:3,4,12,17,18	20:20 48:14	duke 6:5,17 7:2	58:10,14
61:7 65:19	61:19	duly 4:16 90:8	elbow 66:11
66:6 69:14	doj 6:22,23	durham 1:12	elevated 14:15
74:18 75:9,19	32:2	dysfunction	40:11 44:10
75:19,22,23,25	donate 19:9	24:16	46:7,7,8 49:18
76:1,1,5,7,8,10	donated 37:11	dyslipidemia	66:3
76:11,16 77:8	donor 26:16,20	52:24 53:16	email 6:3
79:10 81:19	dosing 31:7	79:19	employed
83:2,21 84:4	dots 57:21 58:5	e	90:15,17
84:11	dr 4:7 14:10	e 2:1,1 4:1,1	employee 90:17
diseases 8:23	40:14 46:23	89:1 90:1,1	encouraged
8:24 19:22	47:2 56:14,19	early 14:21	47:7
disruptive	57:8 63:1,7,21	65:6	endocrine 8:9
27:17	75:8 81:5	eastern 1:1	9:5 10:5 85:22
district 1:1,1	83:19 85:13	easy 64:18	endocrinolog
division 1:2	86:12	68:21	6:5 68:4
9:18	draw 48:6,8	eat 67:11 68:18	endocrinolog
doc 68:9,11	71:16	educated 37:4	63:19
doctor 4:20	drawn 46:14	effect 13:23	endocrinology
23:4 27:5	drink 45:15	14:5 25:7,20	8:19,20,22
54:19 55:6			10:7,24 56:24

[entitled - figure] Page 10

and:41ad 1.0			
entitled 1:9	75:7	explanatory	failure 14:11
episode 20:16	examination	24:22 83:13	18:7 20:19
20:17	4:18 85:11	exposed 29:14	24:9,19,21
episodes 40:11 e	examinations	36:1,23	25:18 32:12,15
equivalent	3:1	exposure 30:20	33:3,8,12 36:5
16:17 e	examined 4:17	30:23 54:4	36:14,15 40:21
errata 88:6	88:3	80:3 81:15	41:1,5 72:3,15
esq 2:5,9,13,19 e	example 37:10	exposures 55:9	72:21 74:1
2:21 e	except 65:12,12	82:2	80:24
establish 48:23 e	exciting 56:9	extend 25:21	fair 17:19 34:3
established e	exclude 31:11	28:1	80:25
35:3 e	excrete 66:19	extended 77:9	fairly 35:13
estimates 30:22 e	excreted 78:20	extensive 11:12	81:6
et 20:12,15	excreting 71:24	extent 41:9	fall 20:11 34:20
82:1	72:1	extra 8:7 18:15	fallen 8:23
	excuse 23:4	eye 43:5 69:7	familiar 30:19
	exercise 68:19	${f f}$	families 83:9
	exhibits 3:6	f 90:1	family 45:2
	expect 49:25	face 22:14	fanciful 25:23
	expected 76:24	fact 36:9 63:17	fancy 77:16
	experience	67:25 81:20	far 7:9 9:5 69:3
81:10	33:18 36:20	factor 22:22	farrin 1:11
	expert 7:25 8:1	53:8 66:12	faster 59:19
76:25	8:8,17 11:7	79:9	fasting 45:9
everyday 50:24	13:22 30:22	factors 34:21	fatigued 72:3
	expertise 9:9	34:23 35:14	felder 2:3
23:18 29:5	30:2,24 32:7	41:4 54:15	fell 78:4
38:1 39:10	80:6 81:1,2,16	66:13 79:13	fellow 10:5
55:16,17 76:19	87:6	80:1,2,8 81:24	fellows 9:14
	experts 86:25	82:17 83:11	felsher's 75:8
	explain 18:4	factual 39:5	fibrosis 74:20
59:14	34:23 69:25	faculty 9:23	field 8:18 19:19
exactly 32:2	85:3		figure 52:19
40:3 48:2 49:5			

[files - genetic] Page 11

files 32:4	fluctuations	39:23	82:4
filtered 43:17	16:5	four 22:4 24:7	functional
73:6	focus 85:22	61:8	19:17 21:11
filtration 16:15	focused 32:8,18	frame 59:10	25:14 28:22
finally 57:24	33:2,2	fred 77:21	29:3 37:14
financially	folks 34:6,8	free 64:19	38:10,25
90:18	follow 19:24	frequency 42:3	functioning
find 10:17	68:9	frequently	19:18
29:21 55:21	followed 83:17	26:20 50:12	functions 21:1
80:7 83:8 87:4	follows 4:17	83:21 84:12	further 61:13
findings 74:13	fooled 68:20	friday 9:22,22	70:14 85:3
fine 20:14,15	foregoing 88:3	fried 75:6	87:8 90:14,16
29:12 32:20	90:5,7,11	front 5:12	future 45:4
54:21	forget 37:5	fun 37:3	g
finger 48:4,6	form 11:3,8	function 13:23	g 4:1
finished 10:6	12:12 13:25	13:24 14:5,5	gap 14:19 60:5
finite 42:17	15:14 17:2,23	14:20 16:5	61:18
first 4:16 6:21	21:23 23:3	19:22,24 20:4	gaps 12:2 61:1
8:3 12:9 14:7	24:4 25:9 27:2	20:7,12,16,17	general 22:1
23:11,14 30:9	27:6,8,10,12,15	20:24 21:8,16	34:7 35:6
40:1 47:9	28:10 31:14	22:3,6 23:10	36:13 48:24
59:23 60:1,1	37:15 38:11	23:13,17 25:20	generalizing
60:13 64:25	54:7 58:2	26:3,3,6,11,12	34:7
74:6 77:8 78:9	75:10 81:12	26:13,22 27:1	generally 19:24
fisher 2:7	formal 8:11	27:23 28:9,19	59:17
fit 50:9	45:22	30:1,10,13	generation
five 41:24	formally 45:23	31:18 35:25	51:22
42:18 50:3,6	formed 27:14	36:21 37:25	genes 83:5,6
50:14 77:18	forward 46:12	38:3,5,8,16	genesis 75:16
84:16	found 37:3	39:8,15 43:23	genetic 41:14
flip 38:13	44:9 83:5	43:25 65:11,14	82:17,22 83:5
floods 18:14	foundation	65:17 69:16	83:10
floor 2:8	29:16 30:7	70:12,25 76:21	
	31:3 33:14,24	77:6,23 81:21	

Golkow Technologies, A Veritext Division

Page 102 of 123

[genetics - held] Page 12

	I	I	T
genetics 41:7	45:25	gotcha 6:9 46:5	39:3 66:8
75:17 83:14	go 5:18 7:17,18	gotten 70:13	72:22
germane 85:4	9:16 12:25	gout 24:18,20	guys 46:12
getting 76:12	16:13,19 37:5	39:11 66:8,10	h
gfr 16:20 66:2	46:2 54:23	66:11,13,16,20	h 86:13
66:14,18 69:11	55:24,24 64:9	79:6	half 6:16 7:5,20
69:13 70:1,21	68:10 70:15	gouty 66:11	10:12 34:15
71:4 73:3	71:19 72:7	government	41:24 73:5
74:19	76:9 77:9	7:21	hang 27:5 29:5
gfrs 50:23	84:16,18	gradual 17:11	happen 28:18
give 8:10 32:4	goal 40:2 47:4	17:20 18:2	84:15
35:17 38:24	48:22,23,25	36:13 51:7	happened
45:14,24 85:5	63:9,11,16,20	gradually	72:19
given 32:25	goes 7:19,20	16:22,22 17:1	happens 28:20
63:25 88:5	15:8,24 16:1	17:10 35:10	29:1
gives 64:17	28:16 43:18	74:24	harbinger
giving 8:12	67:11 74:19	grams 45:14	15:25
68:11	going 5:1,4,18	grand 2:8 9:24	hard 17:6
gjonaj 2:9	10:15 15:19	great 20:20	18:15 21:6
gland 8:24,25	20:18 24:15	42:10	50:2,10 53:3
glands 8:25	39:19 43:9	greater 34:19	66:7 68:21
glimepiride	46:12 51:5	66:3	74:25 84:2
60:8 63:25	54:18 55:24,25	group 17:16	hat 29:5
64:8,10 67:4	58:23 68:10,18	41:20,21,23,23	health 2:3
glomerular	68:18 73:22,23	41:25 42:7	hear 18:20
16:15	80:1 84:15,15	guess 23:23	heard 86:19
glomeruli 28:3	golf 15:20,21	24:3,6 50:19	heart 24:19
38:22 43:18,19	gonads 8:25	51:22 53:12	72:3 75:19,22
glp 67:11,11,12	good 4:2,20	63:13 67:3	76:1,4,7,8,10
glucophage	5:25 28:3	71:8 83:21	76:11,15
64:4 65:4	35:22 36:18	84:9	heavier 53:2
glucose 18:14	42:4 54:24	gut 67:10	held 61:23
40:5 43:17	google 56:14,19	guy 22:2 24:23	
45:13,14,18,24	81:5	35:9 36:10	
	Collrow To		

1017100		0.4.0	
help 18:4 51:20	hoping 73:22	84:3	important 35:5
helps 67:11	hormone 67:10	hyperuricemia	79:12
hematopoietic	hormones 8:23	35:2 79:16	impossible
77:7	hospital 6:17	hypoglycemia	81:20
hemoglobin	14:14 20:10	73:12	improperly
47:3 48:17	22:14 36:10	hypoglycemic	27:13
heritable 83:8	44:11 45:1	65:3	improve 73:2
high 16:1 18:12	49:14 82:8	hypothetical	include 80:3,5
18:21 22:25	85:18	29:8 37:2	80:10,11
24:8,20 35:1	hospitalization	i	includes 16:18
42:14 43:8	35:7 44:9	iacoboni 86:12	including 83:1
44:1,24 45:11	hospitals 48:11	ibuprofen	inclusive 90:11
48:9 49:24	hour 7:5 54:18	78:11	increased
50:13 53:16	hours 7:16	idea 80:18	24:18 82:2
56:18 66:12,14	45:24	identified	incurred 25:16
66:15,19 67:17	how's 72:14	23:22	index 3:1
67:18 68:9	huge 60:5	identify 74:14	indicated 66:1
71:25 83:20,25	huh 73:24	illness 62:10	indication
higher 15:22	humans 43:21	69:1,3	59:23
44:2 46:11	hutchinson	image 19:20	indicative 66:5
hill 2:4	77:21	image 13.20	indiscernible
hint 44:19	hydration	impact 41:4	49:3
history 7:24	69:18 71:2	65:11	individual
34:25,25 40:14	hypercholest	impair 65:16	80:14
86:3	35:1 76:3	impaired 20:13	infected 14:16
hmm 5:11 12:8	hyperglycemia	21:1 39:15	infer 61:12
50:21 56:2	18:13 43:22,24	impairment	63:24
hodgkin's	61:14	14:7 28:9	inference 66:18
85:15	hyperglycemic	37:14 38:3,10	inferences
hold 38:20	44:21,22 61:21	38:25 59:23	58:11 60:9
hood 2:3	hypertension	72:9	infinitesimal
hopefully 5:12	35:11 39:12	implanted	35:19
42:24	40:10,18,20	26:18	infinitesimal
	52:24 83:22,23	20.10	35:21

• £1 4 •	•4 C 20 12	00.20	00.00.00.10.10
inflammation	interfere 30:12	90:20	22:23 23:10,13
43:13 66:25	internal 10:24	june 1:12 4:4	23:16 24:9,11
inflammatory	internet 87:4	71:4	24:15,19,21,23
78:17	interpretation	junk 56:9	25:7,13,18,20
information	33:1 36:9	justice 2:17	25:22 26:1,3,6
17:5,6 26:14	interrupt 54:18	32:25	26:12,16,21,21
31:24 42:10	intolerant	juvenile 50:7	26:25 27:21,22
inhibiting	45:18	k	27:23 28:2,8
78:17	introduce 4:8	keep 63:12	28:19 30:1,1
initial 60:21	intuition 59:10	68:11	30:10,12 31:1
initially 20:23	invasive 19:25	keeps 52:24	31:18 32:11,15
injury 21:1	invoice 7:10	keller 2:11 15:2	33:3,7,12 35:3
49:24	involved 6:1,13	17:16,20 29:13	35:10,25 36:5
inside 50:16	8:4,5 85:22	32:15 33:4	36:13,15,21,21
insufficient	involves 10:13	40:9 41:14	37:7,8,11,11,13
73:7	irony 72:16	54:4 55:19	37:22 38:2,6
insulin 64:1,14	73:17	59:22 63:12	38:10,22 39:4
64:16 67:12,14	irrelevant	65:24 80:14	39:8,19 40:3,7
68:1,5,7,12,13	77:20		40:21 41:1,5
73:4,5,7	ischemic 76:10	82:4,22 83:17 86:5	41:13,18,24
insult 22:12	76:11,14	keller's 16:25	42:3,16,20,25
35:7,8 37:7	j		43:5,18,20,22
43:24 44:1	_	kellerpostma	43:24 44:2
60:22	james 1:11	2:14	47:11,15 49:20
insulting 44:2	january 12:18	kick 64:18	49:24 50:16
intensive 36:16	job 1:25 5:5	kidney 13:23	52:7,13 53:11
41:23 65:15	19:1 20:21	14:5,7,11,12	53:20,23 54:6
intensively	jobs 10:2	16:5,9,14,25	55:13,20 57:13
42:7	joint 66:24	17:21 18:6,7,9	59:14,23 60:3
interested	joints 66:23	18:25 19:5,9	60:4,12,17,18
90:18	journals 6:19	19:10,11,16,17	65:11,14,16,19
interesting	juice 49:9	20:4,19,23,25	66:6 69:14,16
6:15,20 75:15	july 12:22 15:4	21:7,8,11 22:3	70:12,25 72:9
0.12,20 73.13	15:17,19 56:11	22:6,10,12,16	74:13,18 75:6
		shalories	7 1112,10 72.0

75:9,19,23,25	33:23 37:15	62:7 63:9,17	law 1:10
76:1,21 77:6,8	38:11 39:20,23	63:22 64:20	lawsuits 56:9
77:22 79:10	40:23 52:8	66:15 68:9	lawyer 37:3
80:24 81:19,21	54:7,17 58:2	69:3,17,20,23	lay 12:1,5 28:2
82:4 83:2,21	59:2 75:10	71:9,13,13	layperson's
84:3,11	81:12 85:12	72:4,6,23	8:21
kidneys 18:14	87:7	74:10,23,25	leach 14:10
21:19 26:17	knew 62:24	75:6 77:4,9	40:14 46:23
28:17 30:5	know 5:8 10:11	78:3,23 79:1,2	57:8 63:1,21
31:10 38:15,16	12:1,6 13:11	79:8,8 80:19	65:24 83:19
38:16 51:20	13:15,16 14:2	80:20,21 81:2	leach's 47:2
73:6,16 74:17	14:4 16:4 17:5	83:4,7 84:2	61:12 63:7
74:24 78:13,18	19:8 20:1,3	86:11,16,16	lead 39:12
78:19,20 86:22	21:4,9 22:6,11	knowing 35:23	leak 69:7
86:24	23:9,15,15,16	knowledge	learn 37:4
kind 6:22 7:6	24:10,11 25:1	69:9,10 81:9	left 19:10 83:13
9:20 24:15	25:5,6,15,17	known 18:5	legal 34:10,15
30:16 42:19	28:3,25 29:3	30:18 31:1	legally 39:18
43:10 44:22	29:18 30:15,20	knows 55:18	lejeune 1:4 4:5
51:23 53:6	30:21 31:4,6,8	l	6:18 29:14
55:22 58:19	32:21 34:6,24	l 2:17	89:2
64:17 67:6	35:6,15 36:3,3	lab 9:13,13	level 8:5 28:8
70:3,5	36:15 37:23	19:13 21:2	34:13 37:14
kinds 36:14	38:4 40:3,4	27:1 28:9 37:9	43:12 45:6
klotzbucher	41:7,15 42:4	37:12 46:13	47:22 49:23
2:19 3:4 4:12	42:12,19 43:7	51:4 76:20	66:3 69:17
4:13 11:3,8	43:17,17,18,19	labs 61:25	levels 24:20
12:12 13:25	45:10,16 49:20	lack 81:2	30:20 42:2
15:12 17:2,23	50:9,15 53:5	late 72:25	44:5 82:18
21:23 23:3,6	54:9,16,19	latency 30:16	life 28:20
24:4 25:9 27:2	56:13 57:23	31:7 35:25	lifestyle 51:17
27:10 28:10	58:10 59:18,19	36:1,5,8,18,19	likelihood
29:15 30:6	60:6,23 61:2	83:1	22:19 24:8
31:2,14 33:13	61:18,20 62:2	03.1	40:6 81:23

likely 17:20	little 9:8 11:22	18:12 20:1	79:11
18:1 32:11,14	14:24 15:19	21:9 22:7	maintained
33:3,6,11 34:2	18:22 25:23	24:17 26:14	36:11
34:3,9,10,12,18	34:11,15 36:25	29:4 34:8 36:9	major 80:11
39:18 40:6	49:3 62:1	37:4 38:4,15	majority 17:16
41:17 44:24	64:17,18 71:3	39:10 42:21	28:24
58:9,24 59:6,7	llc 2:3,11	53:4 61:3 62:5	make 8:7 16:19
59:8 61:20	long 5:18 49:25	70:25 71:1	18:13 20:1
69:24 82:23	61:21 62:12	73:2 74:18	21:2 27:16
limit 15:8 56:18	69:24	75:15 78:3,24	29:11 30:22
57:2,3,3	longer 42:21	84:9	52:5,5 64:14
limited 58:11	48:18	lots 16:6 22:10	64:16,16 69:18
lindsley 13:6	look 5:9 8:7	22:10 36:6	73:5 75:12
line 71:16 89:5	9:11 21:7,15	love 77:16	81:10
linear 43:10	26:12 32:20	low 51:15 72:1	makes 18:14,25
lisinoprils	38:17 54:14	73:3 81:23	53:13 67:10
51:18	71:23 74:14,21	lower 41:16	72:5 81:22
list 11:13,15,17	74:25	42:23 43:6	82:23
18:9 44:4	looked 11:17	lowering 65:13	makeup 82:22
55:14 77:14	14:12 21:7	lowers 65:17	making 43:23
78:4 79:11	35:13 54:12	lunch 45:20	58:11 60:9
80:3	56:13 77:6	46:14	man 34:21
listed 22:15	86:11,11	luxenberg 2:7	35:14 56:16
77:18	looking 45:4	lymphoma	62:10
listen 5:5	looks 35:9	75:16,16,20	man's 21:19
listing 79:25	67:16 68:22	85:15,17,21	32:5
lists 80:7,9	71:4,8	m	managed 68:15
literally 8:3	lose 26:25	m.d. 1:7 4:15	management
32:13	27:21,23	88:2 89:3	67:24
literature	loss 20:4 72:22	macular 68:25	mangum 1:11
31:25 33:18	73:1	69:8	manifest 22:13
61:5	lost 72:20	made 5:13 6:12	25:13 35:8
litigation 1:4	lot 6:4,6 10:2	22:14 27:7	36:17 50:4
4:6 7:24 89:2	13:14 14:4,19	ΔΔ.14 Δ <i>I</i> .1	
		un handa aine	

Golkow Technologies, A Veritext Division Document 509-3 Filed 08/26/25

www.veritext.com

77 - 40 40 0 4	1 = 0 10 10 10	
		meetings 9:23
		mention 45:3
	43:23 70:4	56:20
	measurements	mentioned
14:9 15:15,16	31:19	26:16 75:13,18
16:14 17:4	measures 20:24	met 72:23
18:5 19:8 20:8	26:2	metabolic 9:1
20:18 21:5,7	mechanism	metformin
23:23 24:1,11	78:16	64:21 65:4
25:4 26:7	mechanisms	metric 17:17
27:25 28:12,13	53:3	michigan 2:8
29:3,4,7,18,18	medical 6:19	middle 65:23
29:20 31:17	12:3 34:6,8,14	mildly 44:10
37:21,22 41:3	34:16,17,24	69:12
41:9 43:16	36:16 39:5	minus 72:24
45:22 46:9,17	46:25 48:10	minute 73:23
48:23 50:2,18	49:22 55:17,17	minutes 46:14
52:10 53:4	61:2 62:12	84:16
60:9,14 62:1,3	67:23 86:2	mm 5:11 12:8
62:5,6 63:17	medically	50:21 56:2
64:21 65:1	51:16	models 43:21
66:7 68:3	medication	moderate 69:12
69:14,22 75:24	72:12	modification
78:1,5,16,17	medicine 10:8	51:17
79:25 80:5,18	10:25 63:24	molecules
81:1 82:25	67:20	78:18
83:23,24 84:3	medicines	moment 32:20
meaningfully	51:17,18 71:2	monday 9:12
81:19	73:11	money 7:17,19
means 34:3	medium 56:22	8:7 59:5
measurable	meds 50:13	months 47:25
25:20	meet 9:13	morning 4:2,20
measure 19:14	meeting 9:13	9:15,22
19:17 45:24		
	18:5 19:8 20:8 20:18 21:5,7 23:23 24:1,11 25:4 26:7 27:25 28:12,13 29:3,4,7,18,18 29:20 31:17 37:21,22 41:3 41:9 43:16 45:22 46:9,17 48:23 50:2,18 52:10 53:4 60:9,14 62:1,3 62:5,6 63:17 64:21 65:1 66:7 68:3 69:14,22 75:24 78:1,5,16,17 79:25 80:5,18 81:1 82:25 83:23,24 84:3 meaningfully 81:19 means 34:3 measurable 25:20 measure 19:14	1:25 mean 6:10 43:23 70:4 12:25 13:11 43:23 70:4 14:9 15:15,16 31:19 16:14 17:4 measures 20:24 18:5 19:8 20:8 26:2 20:18 21:5,7 mechanism 23:23 24:1,11 78:16 25:4 26:7 mechanisms 27:25 28:12,13 53:3 29:3,4,7,18,18 medical 6:19 29:20 31:17 12:3 34:6,8,14 37:21,22 41:3 34:16,17,24 45:22 46:9,17 46:25 48:10 48:23 50:2,18 49:22 55:17,17 52:10 53:4 61:2 62:12 60:9,14 62:1,3 67:23 86:2 66:7 68:3 medically 51:16 medication 72:12 medicine 10:8 81:1 82:25 67:20 83:23,24 84:3 medicines 51:17,18 71:2 73:11 means 34:3 medium 56:22 meds 50:13 meet 9:13 meating 9:13

moving 35:16	network 18:16	57:3,4,12	59:9,12 66:19
multifactorial	never 6:7 8:11	59:16 61:15,24	69:13 71:3,23
76:4	8:12,14 10:22	81:21,21 82:4	74:10 77:19
multiple 82:17	46:18 72:17	82:7	89:4 90:25
murky 26:7	new 35:21	normalize 42:6	numbers 49:20
n	51:22 64:10	normally 49:25	51:8 66:17
	newer 67:7	51:1 64:14	nw 2:17
n 2:1 4:1 name 4:20,21 6:5,25 89:2,3 narrowed 11:22 near 11:17 nearly 56:9 necessarily	newspaper 6:19 nhl 12:17,19,23 21:20 23:20 25:4 33:11 36:22 85:15 86:9 nobel 52:18	normative 56:20 north 1:1,12,15 6:15 90:1,5 notary 1:15 90:4,25 note 3:6 14:23 63:7 74:8	o 4:1 86:13 o'leary 2:21 4:13 obese 50:12 obesity 35:1,11 52:13,14,24
20:8,18 necessary 34:22 need 5:16 32:19 32:19,21 34:20 44:5 64:3 68:12 70:8 needs 54:19	non 63:19 76:14 85:15 nonfunctional 28:7 nonsteroidal 35:2 nonsteroidals 24:17	noted 15:2,5 17:22 46:23 56:11 63:2 notes 47:2 66:8 74:4 84:16 notice 1:9 noticeable 28:9 noticed 7:4	75:25 79:20 objection 11:3 11:8 12:12 13:25 15:12 17:2,23 21:23 23:3 24:4 25:9 27:2,11,12,16 27:17 28:10
neither 90:14 nephrologist 72:5 nephrology 19:19 74:4 nephropathy 35:14 83:7 nephrotoxicity 87:5 nephrotoxin 87:2	normal 9:10 15:3,6,8 16:5 21:2 22:6 23:10,13 26:12 26:21,21 27:22 30:11 36:11 37:12 38:5,7 38:15,16 39:8 42:2,9,23,24,24 45:15,25 48:12 50:18,24 56:16	notion 32:17 64:15 november 47:2 63:8 70:20 noxious 20:12 21:10 35:7 nsaids 78:10 79:6,9,19 number 34:19 45:11 47:5 58:17,19,21	29:15 30:6 31:2,14 33:13 33:23 37:15 38:11 39:20 40:23 52:8 54:7 58:2 59:2 75:10 81:12 objections 27:7 observational 77:5

www.veritext.com

occasions 45:17	67:1 72:14	ozempic 51:23	21:21 25:6
82:9	75:7 77:11	67:9	26:10 29:2
occurred 60:13	78:3,22 79:2	р	33:21 54:11
october 69:11	79:23 82:11,21	p 2:1,1 4:1	60:24
offer 27:11	84:14,17 85:10	86:13	particularly
officer 90:5	86:5	p.c. 2:7	64:23
offices 1:10	old 20:2 56:17	page 3:2 11:17	particulars
oftentimes	64:10 65:5	56:10 63:1	25:17
15:24 45:2	older 49:2	70:20,20 73:23	parties 90:15
68:6	50:11 63:18	78:7 82:10	90:18
oh 14:25 23:2	once 29:19	89:5	past 8:6 22:13
44:16 45:22	64:19 69:22	pager 70:7	85:17
55:23 57:17	71:20 74:17	pages 90:11	pathologist
okay 4:25 5:4	83:19	painful 19:25	74:14
5:19 6:6,21,24	oncologist 11:6	painkillers	pathology 26:8
7:4,20 10:20	62:11	35:2	patient 9:2
11:6,19 12:7	ones 80:12	pancreas 64:14	11:24 12:10,24
13:3,8,22	onset 50:7	papers 77:18	14:8 26:18
16:12 17:19,25	opinion 8:10	paradox 72:15	31:24 39:17
18:4 19:3	32:5 39:6,7	paragraph	44:25 46:10
22:21 23:7,19	60:15 73:19	60:2 65:20,23	48:24 54:3
25:25 29:25	75:8,14 81:17	68:23 78:10	55:12,19 61:25
30:4 31:6 32:6	orange 90:2	parker 2:25	63:11 67:19
32:9,13 34:17	organ 82:13	part 14:18 16:4	68:8,15,17
36:20 37:1	origin 63:4	25:11,15 31:20	73:10 82:24
38:2 39:14	original 63:1	37:3 40:13	patient's 86:2
40:16 43:12	outcome 34:23	48:11 51:2,3	patients 9:3
45:6 46:2,5,13	90:19	58:19 64:8	20:8 22:3
47:14 48:14	outpatient 15:1	73:20 78:16	36:22 49:2
49:11 51:7	outside 9:10	83:13 85:21,24	50:6,11 51:13
52:4 53:19,25	80:6 81:16	86:2	51:15 55:8
55:10,11,16	overweight	particular	59:11 63:18
56:6,10 58:13	52:15 53:10	11:24 19:22	82:15 83:16
59:16,21 63:24			85:14,16,18

20.22 26.22		1 24.0 11 15	25.02
pce 29:23 36:23	percentage	plus 34:8,11,15	precision 35:23
penultimate	53:13	72:24	prediabetic
37:10	period 42:18	pmid 77:19	42:2 44:23
people 6:17 9:4	47:23 49:24	point 8:11,12	predisposition
9:14 17:8,11	61:22 62:13	20:7 29:2,6	41:14
19:24 20:10	periods 30:16	38:24 47:20	prednisone
21:6,7,10	31:7 42:21	48:7 49:13,13	44:14
24:14,17,20	person 2:6,20	57:1,25 64:3	pregnant 46:2
26:12 28:24	2:22 26:20	68:1 72:11,24	preparatory
34:10 35:6	54:11 80:14	75:2,3,5 76:15	13:15
37:5 38:5,17	perspective	79:25	prescribe 64:18
40:1 41:9	8:21	points 15:21	prescription
42:21 44:21,23	petersdorf 13:5	57:19	65:6
48:22 53:7	physical 50:24	popular 67:15	present 74:3
54:10 61:6,15	51:2	populations	preserved 26:6
61:20 64:15,25	piece 59:24	55:13	pressure 20:11
68:7 69:20	pill 67:7	posed 32:14,16	35:1 40:5
72:5,7 76:6,8	pills 68:7,12,16	possible 29:4	50:13 51:18
77:7,7 78:11	pin 24:25	31:20	71:2 83:12
78:23 82:1	pituitary 8:24	postdoctoral	pressures
83:3,4,24 84:9	places 15:7	9:14	40:12 83:25
84:12	75:13 79:7	postman 2:11	presumably
people's 15:24	plaintiff 4:11	potassium	20:6 67:20
50:19	plaintiffs 1:10	71:24,24	75:4
percent 9:4	2:2 4:18	potential 23:20	pretty 11:16
10:11,14 24:14	plasma 67:13	pounds 72:24	12:6 13:20
34:3,8,10,19,19	plateaued	practice 7:18	18:15 42:13
35:16,16,17	69:15 70:17	9:7 85:14	50:9 51:4 61:5
39:14,16,22	play 15:20	precipitant	61:23 67:17,18
41:22,23,24	42:21 53:19	66:16	prevalent 9:6
42:17 47:9	plays 50:14	precipitate	prevent 40:2
76:6,8 81:25	please 4:8 5:8	66:24	preventing
82:1	27:9 39:6	precise 29:8	42:16 48:25
		39:5	

Page 111 of 123

	nuo quo ggi on		mamaa 56.20
prevents 67:8	progression	purview 8:24	range 56:20
67:13	17:12,21 18:2	push 71:3	rapidly 83:3
previous 10:2	18:17,18 19:16	put 13:3 24:24	rate 16:15
primary 64:23	41:13 57:24	64:25 68:1,13	rates 25:17
65:5 66:13	60:21	71:22 80:19	43:8 83:15
67:15 68:5,15	progressive	putting 11:19	rather 35:15
69:2,3	19:11 20:19	\mathbf{q}	rdr 90:24
prior 47:15	72:21	qualified 80:17	read 14:23,25
prize 52:18	projecting	question 5:5,6	29:19 46:22
probably 7:2,3	61:19	5:7,7 20:22	55:25 65:25
10:12 28:16	projections	21:5 27:6,8,14	73:25 76:18
35:21 51:5	61:17	27:19 29:9	77:24 78:1,1
61:13 65:9	prominent	31:16 32:9,13	79:11,18 82:12
68:17 71:8	31:13 40:13	32:21,24 33:10	88:3 89:5
76:3 84:16	promise 52:1	38:14 42:4	reading 67:2
problem 5:17	68:17	54:12 57:20	reads 89:5
8:9 20:7 21:22	promote 76:2	84:5	reality 71:13
31:11,20 72:8	prone 44:20,23	questions 5:5	realize 77:19
85:22	proof 33:21	5:23 56:1 62:5	really 5:9 17:6
problems 5:23	prospective	85:5,13	21:4,5 22:4,14
9:1 24:18	77:5	,	24:9 29:8 35:5
36:14	proteinuria	quick 8:10 87:4	43:7,8 58:11
proceeding	69:12	quickly 22:4	58:11 64:10
90:6,8	provided 11:12	67:13 84:1	67:17 71:24
professionally	12:24	r	73:9 80:16
56:7	proximal 80:23	r 2:1 4:1 86:13	83:25 84:1
professors	public 1:15	89:1,1 90:1	realtime 1:14
72:16	90:4	radiation 13:2	90:4
progress 16:12	pubmed 11:20	13:7,16,19	reason 5:17
16:25 17:10	purely 32:1	86:19	15:18 16:24
83:3,19	purposes 28:2	random 45:10	17:15 21:7,15
progresses	40:16	45:11,16 46:6	50:6 65:1
16:21,22 84:1	pursuant 1:9	57:21 58:6,9	reasonably
,	•	58:14,15 59:8	57:20 59:22

[reasons - risks] Page 22

reasons 74:18	registered 1:13	90:4,4	21:14 22:23,25
rebounded	90:3	reporter's 3:6	23:22 26:22
22:4	related 8:23	reports 8:1,11	27:23,25 30:15
recess 55:2	18:12 36:15	30:22	32:19 33:8,9
84:23	72:8 75:20,23	require 11:14	33:12 34:11
recommendat	78:6 90:15	required 47:4	35:8 36:7,17
64:22	relation 54:6	research 9:12	37:12,18,21
recommended	relative 90:16	9:14 10:15	38:20 39:22
13:6	relatively 81:21	reserve 19:6,8	42:15 44:4
record 4:3 54:1	relevant 25:1	70:25	46:4,19 47:23
54:25 55:3	rely 12:6,10	reserved 87:17	48:20 50:20,24
84:21,24 87:13	remarked 79:7	residency 10:6	51:5 52:7,23
records 13:1,21	remarks 47:16	86:15	55:6 62:21,25
30:9 34:24	48:9	residents 10:9	68:22 69:11
47:1,10,19	remember	residual 22:8	73:19 78:9
48:10 49:22	13:12 86:14	resources 68:6	81:10 84:14
61:12,13,18	remission	respect 25:5	85:2,8
86:6	62:11	rest 28:20	ring 29:23,24
recounting	removed 26:17	70:16	rise 28:8 37:13
69:10	renal 14:5,20	result 38:3	38:24 42:3
reduced 69:12	33:4 39:13,15	retinopathy	44:14,17 51:7
references 61:8	72:15,21 74:1	69:4	51:12,15 67:21
78:4	repeat 27:18	retrospective	rises 19:7
referred 14:10	rephrase 86:8	77:6	risk 24:19,21
28:18 57:8	report 5:13	review 32:4	34:21,22 35:14
74:11	12:4 13:3,5	33:18 80:9	41:5,13 42:24
refers 66:9	16:8 22:15	86:5,21	53:2,7 65:18
reflecting	29:19 32:22,24	reviewed 86:6	66:12,13 73:12
20:23	34:14 44:5	right 4:23,23	76:1 79:9,13
regard 21:14	55:25 61:4	5:10,15,23,25	80:1,2,7 81:24
regarding 86:9	70:16 72:10	6:8 7:6,17,21	82:2 83:5
regardless 39:2	77:25 78:2	7:23 8:3 11:12	risks 31:18
regimen 13:9	reporter 1:14	11:23 16:21	40:4
31:9	1:14 4:9 86:10	18:6,13 20:6	

Page 23 [road - sitting]

		1	1
road 20:18	scars 28:18	seemed 6:15,20	shorter 73:22
27:15	scenario 68:3	13:1 62:12	shot 73:16
rock 2:4	68:14	seems 23:25	show 28:21
roll 64:6	science 42:22	62:4	29:2 31:19
rolling 5:25	scott 1:11	seen 30:21	42:3 43:22
room 2:18	sct 76:23	37:25 63:15	48:15 59:11
roughly 16:17	se 53:2	65:24 69:20,21	82:5
rounds 9:24	search 55:22	72:5,7 74:7	showed 38:1
rule 21:20,25	87:3,4	85:16,18	65:13
21:25 22:17	seattle 77:22	semaglutide	showing 21:1
23:19 30:4	second 51:5	67:9	52:1
ruled 21:18	secondary	semi 56:7	shows 71:10
rules 11:14	12:15	send 8:8	sick 20:11
run 63:18	secrete 67:12	senior 10:17	sicker 63:18
S	73:4	sent 77:13,19	side 34:14,15
s 1:11 2:1 4:1	secretion 67:15	sentence 67:2	34:16,17 38:14
save 14:24	see 9:7,7 14:19	separate 53:3	signature 74:13
saw 12:4 47:9	15:24 16:5	69:8 81:14	87:17 88:10
83:19	19:20 20:8,10	series 77:21	89:25 90:23
saying 18:20	21:8,12,16	serious 25:16	signed 88:6
21:9 31:12	23:18 31:16	62:10	significant
35:15 57:17	35:10 36:7,14	service 6:22	25:14 30:12
75:25 83:15	37:25 39:1	sessions 10:4	signs 62:14,15
says 13:5 63:8	40:1 42:20	set 32:9	similarly 74:23
67:1,2 68:17	44:25 46:22	seven 7:16	simply 81:8
70:20 82:12	47:5 48:8,8	several 36:12	single 15:15
scan 26:9	51:7 53:15	40:11 70:15	16:3 49:12
scar 18:23	60:7 62:14,25	82:9	80:10
74:20	63:4 70:5,14	share 6:24	sir 65:22,25
scarred 28:7	72:16 74:22	shared 33:20	78:8
75:6	seeing 50:23	shed 54:23	sitagliptin 67:4
scarring 18:22	seem 22:14	sheet 88:6	67:5,6,7,13
10.22	25:1	short 36:8	sitting 15:16
		42:19	

situation 9:11	govethown 1.2	stout 10.17	stimulate 64.12
26:15	southern 1:2	start 18:17 19:7 21:1 50:3	stimulate 64:13
	space 66:24		stops 10:22
six 7:16 57:13	speaking 43:1	50:22 59:14	straightforward
59:17	43:15 45:21	64:20,21 70:24	35:13
size 16:18	46:20 48:5	73:10 74:20	street 1:11 2:17
sized 56:22	49:4 54:16	started 50:15	6:17
slightly 15:6	58:16 65:7	60:3,10 68:7	struck 62:1
slowly 83:4	66:22 77:17	starting 61:14	struggling 37:1
small 58:18	84:7	71:21	students 10:8
59:9 69:17	specific 19:21	starts 18:15	studied 54:3
71:1	20:5 32:9,16	69:22 73:7	studies 55:12
smell 62:22	32:21,23 34:18	state 1:15 90:1	55:17 65:13
sole 52:6 59:24	speculate 22:11	statement	77:5,24 83:11
somebody 8:8	28:25	37:21 77:3,4	study 38:5
10:5 19:9 51:9	speculative	states 1:1 2:16	54:11 59:11
65:6 66:9 68:4	32:1	4:6 18:8	77:11
71:22 72:17	spent 9:25	stay 69:24	stuff 9:20 10:15
somebody's 8:6	squeeze 49:9	steady 18:18	10:18,22 11:16
44:20	stabilize 69:21	74:2	28:4,18 30:17
soon 68:2	stage 16:9,12	stem 13:7,17	30:23 35:11
sophie 1:13	16:20,20,23	22:5,12,24	51:24 53:6
90:3,24	17:21 24:23	23:11 31:9	55:22 61:3
sorry 23:5 29:7	25:22 33:4	35:24 36:5,11	62:8 74:20
54:17 70:10	39:13 44:6	36:16 39:9	75:15
sort 9:11 12:1	47:12,15 49:19	54:5 55:9 77:7	sub 10:24
18:13 24:24	50:15,17 51:16	77:23 80:22	subclinical
25:18 69:1	57:10,12,25	81:7,18 82:8	22:12 61:7,22
74:24 83:17	58:25 59:16,24	85:19	subject 55:7
sound 29:24	71:12 73:10	stemming	subsequent
sounds 54:22	74:8	42:16	22:9
54:24 56:25	stages 71:11	steroids 44:12	sudden 73:7
source 19:12	standard 33:21	44:21,22 49:13	sued 8:15
south 2:4	51:4	stick 48:4,6	sufficient 28:6
		, , , , , ,	
		l .	

sugar 15:25	surgically	taken 1:10	39:25 46:19
16:1 18:12,21	26:17	54:10 55:2	64:6 75:1,7
22:25 40:12	susceptibility	57:1 84:23	77:2 78:10
41:5,6,12 42:6	41:8 82:13,19	90:9	82:21
42:14 43:13	83:8	takes 19:12	telling 19:17
44:1,5,15 45:6	susceptible	42:20 50:3	46:6
45:9,10,12,16	41:10	78:24	tells 27:4 81:5
46:7,7,8,11,18	suspect 17:15	talk 6:17 7:23	ten 6:16 66:9
47:14,18,22	suspicious	11:23 40:14	71:8 74:16
48:11 62:18	58:22	48:25 54:14	tend 16:1 35:8
65:13,17 72:17	sustain 39:8	69:25 73:19	50:7
83:12,20	sustaining	77:22,22 83:10	tends 36:17
sugars 44:9,11	20:22	talked 80:21	term 22:1 34:2
46:22 48:9	swear 4:9	83:3	34:12 36:18,19
49:12,19	sweet 62:22	talking 26:1,2	48:18
suggest 43:4	sworn 4:16	55:7 75:5	terms 20:5
suggests 25:15	90:8	76:15 79:13	22:19 49:11
53:1	symptoms	tank 72:6	terrific 84:19
suite 1:11 2:12	62:14 72:2	target 48:24	test 16:17
sulfonylurea	system 62:12	taxes 7:21	45:14
64:8,11,17,25	systemic 13:6	tce 29:23 36:23	testified 4:17
65:14 67:8	13:16	teach 10:1,3,8	testimony 8:12
summer 52:21	t	teaching 9:25	88:4,5 90:7,8
supervision	t 89:1 90:1,1	10:3,13	90:12
90:10	tackling 62:3	team 85:25	tests 50:24
supplemental	tag 19:15	teens 72:25	76:20
77:12	take 6:8 19:6	telephone 2:4,9	texas 2:12
support 23:18	24:17 27:22	2:13,19	textbooks 53:6
31:25 42:22	32:19 50:1	tell 6:1 7:8 8:17	80:9
supposed 27:13	52:20 70:8	8:20 16:3 17:6	thank 85:9 87:8
37:24	78:24 79:3	20:10 21:18	thanks 84:20
sure 22:9 33:22	84:16	22:9 24:1,2	87:11
34:17 66:15		26:24 29:13,25	theoretical
		32:23 39:5,14	29:1 31:18

37:19	69:15 70:14	40:1 41:17	top 18:8 24:25
theory 42:23	71:21 72:23	42:18,21 43:19	81:25 82:12
therapy 13:2,7	74:6 80:17,23	44:6,12,18	85:23
22:13 36:11,16	81:20,22 84:6	45:7,20 47:23	total 7:8
77:23 81:18	85:20 86:18	49:25 50:22	totally 77:20
thereof 90:18	thinking 6:14	52:20,22 56:17	toxic 54:4
thing 7:6 13:17	70:11	56:21 57:9	86:21,24
15:17,23 55:25	thought 23:23	61:6 62:13	toxicity 14:3
60:1 72:22	35:12,15,16	65:18 67:2	toxicologist
73:3 80:10	58:1,4,9,18	69:24 70:6	11:2 30:3
things 16:19	61:19,22,22	72:17,20 74:7	toxicology
19:23 22:15	three 10:4	76:12 83:1	80:17 81:16
23:21 24:7,7,7	14:14 22:4	87:9	track 41:18
26:10 35:8	24:7 39:8	timeline 11:23	50:19 57:12,14
37:4 41:11	47:25 50:3,14	times 27:7	tracking 14:19
51:20 71:1	54:15 55:14,19	42:13 59:20	trained 64:24
72:19 74:25	59:18 61:7	68:20 70:15	64:24
75:17 76:2,9	75:13 76:22	timey 65:5	training 10:6
83:2	77:2,10 81:22	timing 45:19	transcribed
think 5:17 7:10	throw 24:9	tissue 18:23	90:10
12:4,21 14:10	throwing 73:11	74:14	transcription
14:16 15:20	thursday 9:21	today 65:9	88:5 90:12
18:1 20:4 21:6	thyroid 8:25	today's 4:3	transient 22:2
23:8 24:2	tied 26:11	together 76:9	44:14
25:23 27:7	tight 63:18	told 72:16	transplant 13:7
28:12,13,14	till 86:15	80:21,22	13:17 23:11
30:18 32:20	time 4:4 5:16	tolerance 45:13	24:12 27:19
33:16 36:13	6:11,16,18	46:1	36:6,17 37:23
38:4 39:3 43:2	7:12 8:4 9:25	toll 78:24 79:3	39:9 80:22
46:2 49:2 50:5	10:12,14 14:24	79:4	transplantation
52:10 53:1	18:16 20:9,11	tonight 15:20	22:5
55:7 57:1,7	24:24 25:14	took 79:4,6	treat 40:4,5
58:10,18 59:7	28:9 29:2,6	86:6,8	41:11 83:11,12
61:4 63:16,19	30:16 35:5		

Page 117 of 123

treated 13:5	try 40:2	ultimately	unusual 64:22
42:7 51:16	trying 8:7	67:25	upper 15:8
85:14,17	29:11 82:25	ultrasound	57:2,2,3
treating 41:6	tubules 43:19	26:9	upswing 15:10
64:7 67:19	43:20	unbilled 7:13	uremia 72:2
treatment	tuesday 9:15	unclear 5:8	uric 24:20 47:6
12:19,21,23	9:16	uncomfortable	66:2,12,16,19
13:4,23 21:20	turned 70:18	68:5	66:21,23
22:5 23:19	turns 78:23	uncommon	urine 62:15,18
25:4,6,7 33:11	twice 75:19	67:21 68:14	62:22
35:18 36:23	two 10:2 16:19	uncontrolled	usdoj.gov 2:20
40:13 49:6	19:22 22:25	40:9,17,25	2:21
75:9,20 80:4	24:7 26:17	41:12 83:22,23	use 19:15 26:15
81:8,18,22	31:11 45:17,23	under 8:24	44:4,19 64:24
82:5,9 85:15	45:24 55:13	71:10,12,20	65:1 68:7,8
86:9	57:19 75:13	82:23 90:10	86:15
treatments	77:9 80:7	undergoing	used 13:9 34:2
22:24 36:7	81:14	85:18	34:5 50:7
55:9 65:15	tying 26:13,13	undergone	62:20,23 86:15
85:19	type 24:14	36:22	86:16
trend 16:4	39:14,17 46:24	understand	using 34:12,13
trial 8:13 27:14	50:5,6,10,19	10:23 21:17	usual 41:20,22
37:3	54:5 61:6,11	33:22 56:24	usually 10:18
trials 41:20	61:21 63:2	71:18 75:7	19:10 28:21
42:7	64:15 76:7	80:14,15 85:24	50:2 51:8
trichloroethyl	83:16	understood	64:21 71:20
29:20	typical 73:9	6:12 7:23	\mathbf{v}
trouble 71:23	u	51:11 87:7	v 2:19 4:6
71:25 85:16	u.s. 2:17	united 1:1 2:16	value 15:16
true 37:18,21	uh 73:24	4:6 18:8	16:3 82:7
38:1 60:25	ultimate 34:23	university	vancomycin
62:24 84:13	72:18	13:21	87:1
85:20 88:4		unknown 53:14	
90:11			

www.veritext.com

Page 119 of 123

	I	I	
variability	vincristine	week 10:5,12	wobble 71:1
69:19 70:6	86:17	weight 72:20	women 46:2
variable 34:25	visit 15:1	72:22,23 73:1	wonderful 5:15
71:15 83:24	vitamin 78:11	weights 72:25	word 35:21
variance 82:16	W	weitz 2:7	work 9:2,15,18
83:10	walla 62:6,6	weitzlux.com	10:7,9 18:14
variation 58:20	86:12,12	2:10	19:13 21:2
59:8	want 6:12 45:4	welcome 70:8	27:1 30:16
varies 82:14	52:20 54:16	went 13:12	37:9,12 40:17
variety 43:21	85:3,5	57:17 82:8	52:21 72:14
various 40:4	wants 54:19	west 2:8	worked 6:15
vary 83:16	washington	white 84:6	18:19
vascular 53:21	2:18 13:12,21	wide 43:20	workup 76:13
76:16	watch 46:12	69:19	workweek 9:10
vast 28:23	water 40.12 water 1:4 4:5	william 2:19	worry 45:1
venous 48:6,7	30:5 33:6	4:13	worse 42:14
version 13:11	54:23 89:2	william.v.klo	84:2
versus 6:13	watershed	2:20	worsening 74:2
34:9 47:22	54:23	willing 34:9	worth 69:10
58:15	way 15:10	win 52:18	write 56:3,7
vessel 53:22	29:11 32:16	witness 4:9	writing 8:11
vessels 69:6	34:5 38:21	11:4,10 12:14	9:19
veterans 6:16	39:1 40:25	14:2 15:15	written 8:1
videographer	58:10 59:6,10	17:4,25 21:25	wrong 27:6,8
2:24 4:2 54:25	59:21 61:2	23:5,7 24:6	37:20 77:19
55:3 84:21,24	62:20,24 66:14	25:11 27:4,18	wrote 56:5
87:13	67:14 69:20	28:12 29:18	76:18 77:25
videotaped 1:7	70:11 81:2	30:9 31:4	86:25
view 22:7 38:2	we've 11:12	33:16 38:13	y
38:9 66:5	80:21	39:25 52:10	
79:23	website 6:5 7:2	54:9,22 58:4	yeah 5:14 6:10
viewpoint		75:12 81:13	6:23 7:3,7,22
59:13	wednesday	85:10 87:10,12	8:5,22 10:16
	1:12 4:3 9:17	89:3 90:7,9,13	10:19,21,23
		abnologies	

Page 29 [yeah - zoom]

74:16 75:12
77:15,18 78:5
78:12,21 79:15
79:17,22 80:15
81:4,11 82:20
82:25 84:8,10
84:19 85:20
86:7,23 87:10
87:12
year 20:14 36:7
77:2,8
yearly 51:2
years 6:16
17:13 22:4
23:11,14 36:12
39:9 41:24
42:18 50:3,3,6
50:14,16,17
53:5 57:13
59:17 61:8
63:14 64:12
65:8 66:9
69:24 71:8
74:16 76:22
77:10 81:22
yep 51:25
young 8:6 50:7
Z
zina 2:13
zina.bash 2:14
zoom 2:10,14
2.10,17

Golkow Technologies, A Veritext Division

Page 120 of 123

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 30

- (e) Review By the Witness; Changes.
- (1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:
- (A) to review the transcript or recording; and
- (B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.
- (2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES

ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1,

2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES

OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted

fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions'
confidentiality and security policies and practices
should be directed to Veritext's Client Services
Associates indicated on the cover of this document or
at www.veritext.com.