In The Matter Of:

Paul Halderson, et al., v. Star Blends, et al.

Lewis G. Sheffield, Ph.D. March 14, 2014 Volume 1

Metropolitan Court Reporters, Inc. 13306 Huntington Circle Apple Valley, Minnesota 55124

> Original File SHEFFIEL.TXT Min-U-Script® with Word Index

Star	Blends, et al.		March 14, 2014
	Page 1		Page 3
1	STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT TREMPEALEAU COUNTY	-	EVHIDIT INDEV
2		1	
3	Paul Halderson and Case No. 12-CV-74	2	
4	Lyn M. Halderson, N17388 County Road Galesville, Wisconsin 54630	3	
5	_	4	
6	and	5	
7	Arctic View Farms, LLC 1919 Riley Rd.	6	By Mr. Thornton: 3.
8	Sparta, Wisconsin 54656,		
9	Plaintiffs,	8	5
10	vs.	10	ala ala ala da
11	Star Blends LLC 1919 Riley Rd.	11	
12	Sparta, Wisconsin 54656	12	
13	and	13	
14	ABC Insurance Company, a fictitious company	14	ala ala ala ala
15	and	15	
16	Northern States Power Company	16	
17	Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy Services Inc. 1414 W. Hamlin Avenue Eau Claire, WI 54702, Defendents	17	
18	Eau Claire, WI 54702, Defendants.	18	
19		19	
20	VOLUME I	20	
21	Deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, taken	20	CD OGG FILLA (DLA FILO) I
22	pursuant to Notice of Taking Deposition, and taken	22	
23	before John T. Kirby, a Notary Public in and for the		BY MR. THORNTON:
24	County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, on the 14th day	24	
25	of March, 2014, at 1 South Pinckney Street, Madison,	25	
26	Wisconsin, commencing at approximately 12:35, p.m.	26	
27		27	
28		28	
29		29	
30		30	
	Page 2		Page 4
1	APPEARANCES:		
2	Natalia Blaskovich, Esquire, of the firm	1	
3	of REYNOLDS & KENLINE, LLP, 110 East Ninth Street, P.O.		A Very little. I knew it existed and that's about it.
4	Box 239, Dubuque, Iowa 52004-0239, 563-556-8000,	3	
5	blaskovich @rkenline.com,	4	5
6	-and-	5	1
7	Scott Lawrence, Esquire, of the LAWRENCE	6	A And introducing ourselves in the lobby. That was all. Q What do you do for a living, doctor?
8	LAW OFFICE, S.C., 403 South Fourth Avenue, P.O. Box 117,		
9	Saint Nazianz, Wisconsin 54232-0117, 920-773-2811,		A I teach biology courses and occasionally chemistry at MATC, Madison Area Technical College, in Portage.
10	ATTORNEYS@LDLAWSTN.COM, appeared jointly representing	9	
11	the Plaintiffs.	10	
12		12	A I don't know. Takes me about 45 minutes or so to drive there. Mileage, I'm not sure.
13	Timothy R. Thornton, Esquire, of the firm		
14	of BRIGGS & MORGAN, 2400 IDS Center, Minneapolis,	13	
15	Minnesota 55402, 612-977-8400, tthornton@briggs.com,	14	
16	appeared representing Defendant NSP/Xcel Energy.		A Yes. I received a bachelor of science degree from Clemson University in animal science, stayed there for a
17		16 17	
18	Catherine M. Rottier, Esquire, of the firm	18	
19	of BOARDMAN & CLARK, LLP, 1 South Pinckney Street, Suite		A Well, it was called animal and food industries, but
20	410, P.O. Box 927, Madison, Wisconsin 53701-0927,	20	
21	608-257-9521, crottier@boardmanclark.com, appeared	20	
- -	representing Defendant Star Blends.	21	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
22			
22 23		22	oost doctoral researcher at which gan State University
23		23	
23 24	ALSO PRESENT:	24	with Dr. Shuford Welch, who is a breast cancer
23 24 25		24 25	with Dr. Shuford Welch, who is a breast cancer researcher.
23 24 25 26	ALSO PRESENT: Theresa A. Peterson, DVM.	24 25 26	with Dr. Shuford Welch, who is a breast cancer researcher.Q Is there an overlap between mammary development and
23 24 25 26 27	ALSO PRESENT: Theresa A. Peterson, DVM. VIDEOGRAPHER:	24 25 26 27	with Dr. Shuford Welch, who is a breast cancer researcher.Q Is there an overlap between mammary development and breast cancer?
23 24 25 26 27 28	ALSO PRESENT: Theresa A. Peterson, DVM. VIDEOGRAPHER: Mark C. Haskins, HASKINS MEDIA SERVICES,	24 25 26 27 28	with Dr. Shuford Welch, who is a breast cancer researcher.Q Is there an overlap between mammary development and breast cancer?A Yes.
23 24 25 26 27 28 29	ALSO PRESENT: Theresa A. Peterson, DVM. VIDEOGRAPHER: Mark C. Haskins, HASKINS MEDIA SERVICES, 1071 Whitney Drive, Apple Valley, Minnesota 55124,	24 25 26 27 28 29	with Dr. Shuford Welch, who is a breast cancer researcher.Q Is there an overlap between mammary development and breast cancer?A Yes.Q And what did you do after 1986?
23 24 25 26 27 28	ALSO PRESENT: Theresa A. Peterson, DVM. VIDEOGRAPHER: Mark C. Haskins, HASKINS MEDIA SERVICES,	24 25 26 27 28 29	with Dr. Shuford Welch, who is a breast cancer researcher.Q Is there an overlap between mammary development and breast cancer?A Yes.

Star Dichus, et al.	March 14,	, = • = •
	Page 5 Pa	age 7
1 the Department of Dairy Science.	1 surface with ceptors on the surface of lymphocytes,	and
		anu
2 Q Go ahead. I don't mean to interrupt y		
3 A I was just going to say, I was initial		
4 professor, left there in 2010 as full p	professor. 4 measured the level of messenger RNA of certain ge	enes.
5 Q And was there any area of specialty that		
6 University of Wisconsin?	6 is - perhaps I should explain what messenger RNA i	
7 A I worked predominantly on mammary glar		
8 which is what my training was in.	8 genes. Coding for - a wide variety of things that	they
9 Q Did you have any special focus on immuno		
	n immunology, 10 express these proteins, the interleukins, for insta	nce,
11 mostly on the stray voltage related wor		
12 have considered myself an immunologist,	per se, but I did 12 the intermediate molecule called Messenger RN.	A, a
13 do some work on that. Genetics, in	terms of gene 13 processed called transformation. That is then used	as a
14 expression, I did some work on that, in		
		iii, a
15 relationship to mammary gland developme		c
16 that depends a little bit on how you de		
17 Q What did you do - can you give me a br	rief overview of 17 the actual proteins. We then studied the production	n of
18 what you did in the area of stray vol		eins.
19 A Yes. I don't recall the year, but someti		
1 5 <i>I</i> X Test. I don't feedh the year, but someth	in a different Dr.	wittii
a researcher that was affiliated was		
21 department, Ag. Engineering. Dr. Douglas		
22 doing some research on stray voltage, an	nd the question 22 Q He did the engineering side of it and you did	the
23 arose: "Are there ways to measure		
24 responses that might be relevant to in		
		2002
25 stress, in general?" And that began som		ber?
did in collaboration with him, measuring		
27 of immune function in dairy cattle that ha	ad been exposed 27 Q What happened to that work?	
28 to voltages.	28 A That, we never published that. We did not find a lo	ot of
29 Initially, we were measurin		
30 to think of the best way of wording	it - levels of 30 things were I want to say inconsistent erratic and	
30 to think of the best way of wording	it - levels of 30 things were, I want to say inconsistent, erratic, and	we
	Page 6 Pa	age 8
 various proteins associated with immune 	Page 6 Pa	age 8
	Page 6 Pa	age 8 [did
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inter 	Page 6 e function in the erleukins, which 2 did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an	age 8 [did
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.	age 8 [did iy of
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells,1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin	age 8 [did ay of n?
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is	age 8 [did ay of n?
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd s like phagocytic,1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.200030004QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 505ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.	age 8 did by of n? s the
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd s like phagocytic,1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp	age 8 did y of n? s the peri-
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd 5 like phagocytic, 1 them, because an.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not. 4 Q What is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 5 A College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture. 7 Q Is there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic	age 8 did y of n? s the peri-
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd 5 like phagocytic, 1 them, because an.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.2not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?	age 8 didd y of n? s the peri- cally
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd 5 like phagocytic, 1 them, because an.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.2Not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3UWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 5 A College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is 6 College of Agriculture.7Q15Sthere a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?9Io A That's not the purpose of that committee. That statistic	age 8 didd ay of n? s the peri- cally unds
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd 5 like phagocytic, 1 them, because an.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.2not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?	age 8 didd ay of n? s the peri- cally unds
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd s like phagocytic, l them, because an.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is 66College of Agriculture.77QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?10AThat's not the purpose of that committee. That sta for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commit	age 8 d did ay of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee.
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you're 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd s like phagocytic, i them, because an.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 5 A College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is 6 College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commi They monitor the use of experimental animals to make sure	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you's with, please let me know and I can defined 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd s like phagocytic, i them, because an.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 5 A College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is 6 College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?9Io A That's not the purpose of that committee. That stat for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commi They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow	age 8 d did ay of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed.
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you'r with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.2not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?9Io AThat's not the purpose of that committee. That stat for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commit They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow14QIs there any entity associated with the University	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inter are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you'r with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.2not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?7QIs there a unit called the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commi They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow9of cells called nt in a variety of149Is there any entity associated with the University Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you's with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initial 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.2not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3the immune eutrophile cells, nd6What is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 5 A College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7Q1Is there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?9Orrect and significant?10A11That's not the purpose of that committee. That sta for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commi They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow14Q15Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inter are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you'r with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.2not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3the immune eutrophile cells, nd6What is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 5 A College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7Q1Is there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?9Orrect and significant?10A11That's not the purpose of that committee. That sta for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commi They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow14Q15Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you's with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initial 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.2not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?9AThat's not the purpose of that committee. That sta for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commi They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow14QIs there any entity associated with the University Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?17ANone that I'm aware of.	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inter are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you'r with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initi measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.2not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?9Or cells called nt in a variety of tital studies we es to respond to nicals that are9Is there any entity associated with the University Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?17A18QWas there any review of the statistical work that you	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you' with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initi measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.2not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?7QIs there an unit called the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commi They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow10AThat's not the purpose of that committee. That sta for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commi They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow14QIs there any entity associated with the University Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?17ANone that I'm aware of.18QWas there any review of the statistical work that you Dr. Reinemann did early on?	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you'r with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initi measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth respond to. 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an 31a like phagocytic, d them, because an. (-i-c. C you.2What is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 5ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?Ye not familiar ie it. Phagocytic o of cells called nt in a variety of tital studies we es to respond to incals that are hing they shouldPage 6Page 6 ting they shouldPage 6 diagocytic, and the purpose of that committee.Page 6 tital studies we ing they shouldPage 6 the purpose of that committee.Page 6 tital studies we te sto respond to ticals that are hing they shouldPage 6 the purpose of the statistical work that you por the use of experimental animals to make su appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow the purpose of the statistical work that you por the statistical work that you por the issociated with the University to incals that are hing they shouldPage 6 time they shouldPage 6 they shouldPage 6 time they shouldPage 6 they shouldPage 7 time they shouldPage 6 they shouldPage 8 time they shouldPage 6 they shouldPage 9 time they shouldPage 6 they shouldPage 9 time they shouldPage 6 they should<	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inter are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you'r with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initi measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd 5 like phagocytic, d them, because an.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin that work or not.5ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?6You.10A7Page 678menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?9Is there any entity associated with the University Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?14QIs there any entity associated with the University Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?14QIs there any review of the statistical work of researchers?15ANone that I'm aware of.18QWas there any review of the statistical work that you Dr. Reinemann did early on?20AThe statistical analysis on this early work was dom Steven LeMire.	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inter are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you' with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initi measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? A Well, yes. Antigens, that's a good wate 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.a like phagocytic, d them, because an.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 5A College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is 6College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?6. it. Phagocytic o of cells called nt in a variety of tital studies we es to respond to nicals that are hing they should107ANone that I'm aware of.18QWas there any review of the statistical work that you Dr. Reinemann did early on?20AThe statistical analysis on this early work was done Steven LeMire.21QWho is Steven LeMire?	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of a and e by
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you'r with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initi measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? A Well, yes. Antigens, that's a good wa That's accurate. 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd Slike phagocytic, I them, because an. -i-c.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.92What is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 514QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is 661them, because an. -i-c.7Q7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic o correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic o correct and significant?9Is there any entity associated with the University Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?10A11The monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow14Q15Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?16R17A18Q19Dr. Reinemann did early on?20A21Who is Steven LeMire?23A24Who is Steven LeMire?23A24Wiso associated with Dr. Lyman. I do not recall	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of a and e by l the
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inter are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you' with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initi measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? A Well, yes. Antigens, that's a good wate 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd Slike phagocytic, I them, because an. -i-c.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.92What is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 514QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is 661them, because an. -i-c.7Q7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic o correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic o correct and significant?9Is there any entity associated with the University Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?10A11The monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow14Q15Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?16R17A18Q19Dr. Reinemann did early on?20A21Who is Steven LeMire?23A24Who is Steven LeMire?23A24Wiso associated with Dr. Lyman. I do not recall	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of a and e by l the
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, an Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you'r with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initi measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? A Well, yes. Antigens, that's a good wa That's accurate. 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd Slike phagocytic, I them, because an. -i-c.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.92What is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 514QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 55ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is 661them, because an. -i-c.7Q7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic o correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic o correct and significant?9Is there any entity associated with the University Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?10A11The monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow14Q15Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?16R17A18Q19Dr. Reinemann did early on?20A21Who is Steven LeMire?23A24Who is Steven LeMire?23A24Wiso associated with Dr. Lyman. I do not recall	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of a and e by l the as a
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inter are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you'r with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are important aspects of immunology, and in the initi measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth or respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? A Well, yes. Antigens, that's a good wa That's accurate. Q So, when a bacteria or a virus or som enters 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.3that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin for the immune an.5ACollege of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?9Io AThat's not the purpose of that committee. That stat for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commit They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow14QIs there any entity associated with the University Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?15ANone that I'm aware of.16Was there any review of the statistical work was done Steven LeMire.20AThe statistical analysis on this early work was done Steven LeMire.21Steven LeMire.22QWho is Steven LeMire?23AHe was associated with Dr. Lyman. I do not recall details of that association, as to whether he way graduate student or research associate or what	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of a and e by l the as a
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you's with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are importar aspects of immunology, and in the init measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth or respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? A Well, yes. Antigens, that's a good wa That's accurate. Q So, when a bacteria or a virus or som enters A Yes. In fact, one of the things we measured 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd 6 like phagocytic, 1 them, because an.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an ot that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 5 A College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is 6 College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?-i-c. (x you.10A That's not the purpose of that committee. That stat for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commit They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of tital studies we es to respond to nicals that are hing they should18Q Was there any review of the statistical work that you Dr. Reinemann did early on?20A The statistical analysis on this early work was done Steven LeMire?20Who is Steven LeMire?23A He was associated with Dr. Lyman. I do not recall details of that association, as to whether he way graduate student or research associate or what details were.26	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of a and e by l the as a the
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you' with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are importar aspects of immunology, and in the init measured the ability of the lymphocyte various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? A Well, yes. Antigens, that's a good wa That's accurate. Q So, when a bacteria or a virus or som enters A Yes. In fact, one of the things we measur to was a particular bacteria, staphylo 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd 6 like phagocytic, d them, because an.1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsin 5 A College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is 6 College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?6You.10A That's not the purpose of that committee. That stat for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commi They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s a ppropriate animal welfare regulations are follow U is there any review of the statistical work of ticals that are hing they shoulday of putting it.2QWho is Steven LeMire?ay of putting it.2QWh	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of a and e by l the as a the
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you' with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are importar aspects of immunology, and in the initi measured the ability of the lymphocyte various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? A Well, yes. Antigens, that's a good wa That's accurate. Q So, when a bacteria or a virus or som enters A Yes. In fact, one of the things we measu to was a particular bacteria, staphylo Others were lectins from Pokeweed 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an ot ha twork or not.3it do not know if Doug might have published an of the immune eutrophile cells, at QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsir that work or not.4QWhat is CALS at the University of Wisconsir to College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?9correct and significant?10A11for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Commi They monitor the use of experimental animals to make s appropriate animal welfare regulations are follow14Q15Wisconsin that examines the statistical work of researchers?16A17A18Q19Dr. Reinemann did early on?20A21A22Q23A14etails of that associated with Dr. Lyman. I do not recall details of that association, as to whether he wa graduate student or research associate or what details of that association or did he have expertis statistics?23A24But was he a statistician or did he have expertis statistics?	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of a and e by l the as a the e in
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inte are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of ne which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you's with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are importar aspects of immunology, and in the initis measured the ability of the lymphocytes various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? A Well, yes. Antigens, that's a good wa That's accurate. Q So, when a bacteria or a virus or som enters A Yes. In fact, one of the things we measu to was a particular bacteria, staphylo Others were lectins from Pokeweed Q What is lectins? 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an ot hat work or not.3it do not know if Doug might have published an of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an ot at work or not.3it do not know if Doug might have published an of the immune shike phagocytic, them, because an.2What is CALS at the University of Wisconsin to College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic of cells called nt in a variety of tital studies we es to respond to itcals that are hing they should109AThat's not the purpose of the statistical work that you portiat animal welfare regulations are follow to full studies we to a the statistical analysis on this early work was done to a The statistical analysis on this early work was done to a The statistical analysis on this early work was done to a The statistical and the purpose to a The statistical and the purpose to a The statistical and the purpose tial studies we tial studies we tial studies we to a The statistical analysis on this early work was done to a The statistical analysis on this early work was done to a The was associated with Dr. Lyman. I do not recall details of that association, as to whether he way graduate student or research assoc	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of a and e by l the as a the e in
 various proteins associated with immune blood, such as immunoglobulins and inter are chemicals that regulate function of system. And we measured activity of net which are major phagocytic cells, and Q Doctor, when you say some of the words it would help Mr. Kirby if you spelled you're probably the only one who ca A Okay. Phagocytic. P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t- THE REPORTER: Thank Q Sorry I interrupted you. A I apologize. If I use a term that you' with, please let me know and I can define simply means cell heat. And a group lymphocytes. Lymphocytes are importar aspects of immunology, and in the init measured the ability of the lymphocyte various stimulants. These are chem recognized by the lymphocytes as someth respond to. Q So, antigens, for example? A Well, yes. Antigens, that's a good wa That's accurate. Q So, when a bacteria or a virus or som enters A Yes. In fact, one of the things we measu to was a particular bacteria, staphylo Others were lectins from Pokeweed 	Page 6Page 6e function in the erleukins, which of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an ot hat work or not.3it do not know if Doug might have published an of the immune eutrophile cells, nd1did not pursue publication of that, or at least I not. I do not know if Doug might have published an ot at work or not.3it do not know if Doug might have published an of the immune shike phagocytic, them, because an.2What is CALS at the University of Wisconsin to College of Agriculture and Lab Science, that is College of Agriculture.7QIs there a unit called the ICCUC that meets with exp menters to make sure that their work is statistic correct and significant?8menters to make sure that their work is statistic of cells called nt in a variety of tital studies we es to respond to itcals that are hing they should109AThat's not the purpose of the statistical work that you portiat animal welfare regulations are follow to full studies we to a the statistical analysis on this early work was done to a The statistical analysis on this early work was done to a The statistical analysis on this early work was done to a The statistical and the purpose to a The statistical and the purpose to a The statistical and the purpose tial studies we tial studies we tial studies we to a The statistical analysis on this early work was done to a The statistical analysis on this early work was done to a The was associated with Dr. Lyman. I do not recall details of that association, as to whether he way graduate student or research assoc	age 8 did y of n? s the peri- cally unds ttee. sure wed. y of of a and e by l the as a the e in

Ju	r Bl	ends, et al.			March 14, 2014
		Page 9			Page 11
-	Ο	And what's your basis for concluding that your conty work	-	Ο	Oh got it
1	V	And what's your basis for concluding that your early work didn't come up with anything that was statistically			Oh, got it. The other thing that you see, if you look at the figures
				A	
3	٨	significant, and, in fact, was contradictory?	3		here, on page 25, you see things like, Figure 2, we have
	A	Well, I didn't say - I didn't mean to imply contra-	4		an elevation, or we have a level, it drops and then it
5	0	dictory.	5		comes back up. We don't see flat lines or lines that are
6	Q		6		diverging. I'm not sure what that means. It's what we
	А	If you look at the work, we have a table here that is	7		found. But the only thing in here that we found that was
8	0	Table 2.	8	0	statistically significant was the IgA levels.
		What are you looking at now?			And that's under the treatment column, the .015?
		I'm looking at this file here (indicating).		~	Yes. Yes. Correct.
		Okay. Can we mark that as an exhibit?	11	Q	
	A	Yes. You have a copy of that. I sent you a copy of	12		reasonable degree of scientific certainty, didn't
13	~	this.	13		necessarily mean anything?
		My people didn't give it to me, unfortunately.	14		MR. LAWRENCE: I'm gothing to object to the
	А	Oh, okay.	15		form as leading. All right. Go ahead.
16		MR. LAWRENCE: Perhaps I can help. If			I don't know if I would say it doesn't mean anything.
17		that's the same data as the paper that was eventually	17	Q	Could you draw any conclusions from these data to a
18		published, I've got it along.	18		reasonable degree of scientific certainty?
19	Q	I've got the published paper. This is the early work.	19	А	To a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, this
20		Why don't we mark it as 249.	20		study, based on 12 treated and 12 controlled cows, showed
21	А	Okay. This is what I'm referring to.	21		a probability that IgA was lower in terms of statistics.
22	Q	Okay. Can the court reporter mark your copy as 249?	22		That is not the same as biologic significance.
23	А	Yes.	23		Biological and statistical significance are different
24	Q	We'll get it back to you. That's what you missed, Scott,	24		ideas.
25		first 248 exhibits.	25	Q	Two different animals, right?
26		MR. LAWRENCE: Thank God.	26	Ã	Correct. Correct. So, statistically we saw a difference
27	А	Okay. I'm referring here to Table 2.	27		in Serum IgA.
	Q	Table 2. What page?	28	Q	Could you say to a reasonable degree of scientific
29		22.	29	-	certainty that there was biological significance in
30	Q	Page 22. Okay.	30		anything you
		с .			
		Page 10			Page 12
		Page 10			Page 12
	A	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment		A	I've always I'll let you finish the question.
2	A	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is	2	A	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead.
2 3		Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the	2 3	A	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his
2 3 4		Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally	2 3 4	_	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question.
2 3 4 5		Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it	2 3 4 5	_	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it
2 3 4 5 6		Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant.	2 3 4 5 6	_	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values?	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q A	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt You, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulin
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria. And that's 95 percent certain?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt You, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulins. Immunoglobulin A makes a very minor contribution to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria. And that's 95 percent certain? 95 percent certain that it's not due to random chance, or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulins. Immunoglobulin A makes a very minor contribution to immunoglobulins in circulation. It's importance is in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria. And that's 95 percent certain? 95 percent certain that it's not due to random chance, or a 5 percent chance that it is due to random chance.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulins. Immunoglobulin A makes a very minor contribution to immunoglobulins in circulation. It's importance is in what is called mucosal immunity. The mucosal tissue is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria. And that's 95 percent certain? 95 percent certain that it's not due to random chance, or a 5 percent chance that it is due to random chance. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulins. Immunoglobulin A makes a very minor contribution to immunoglobulins in circulation. It's importance is in what is called mucosal immunity. The mucosal tissue is what lines many of the cavities of the body and surfaces.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria. And that's 95 percent certain? 95 percent certain that it's not due to random chance, or a 5 percent chance that it is due to random chance. And - And if we look down, most of these numbers are fairly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt You, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulins. Immunoglobulin A makes a very minor contribution to immunoglobulins in circulation. It's importance is in what is called mucosal immunity. The mucosal tissue is what lines many of the cavities of the body and surfaces. For example, the lining much of the intestine is a
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 A Q A Q A Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria. And that's 95 percent certain? 95 percent certain that it's not due to random chance, or a 5 percent chance that it is due to random chance. And - And if we look down, most of these numbers are fairly large, with one major exception, and that is,	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 A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt you, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulins. Immunoglobulin A makes a very minor contribution to immunoglobulins in circulation. It's importance is in what is called mucosal immunity. The mucosal tissue is what lines many of the cavities of the body and surfaces. For example, the lining much of the intestine is a mucosal tissue.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria. And that's 95 percent certain? 95 percent certain that it's not due to random chance, or a 5 percent chance that it is due to random chance. And - And if we look down, most of these numbers are fairly large, with one major exception, and that is, immunoglobulin A. Serum IgA, and my lines are not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q A Q	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt You, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulins. Immunoglobulins in circulation. It's importance is in what is called mucosal immunity. The mucosal tissue is what lines many of the cavities of the body and surfaces. For example, the lining much of the intestine is a mucosal tissue. Most of the IgA in the body is not found
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	QAQ A QAQA QA	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria. And that's 95 percent certain? 95 percent certain that it's not due to random chance, or a 5 percent chance that it is due to random chance. And - And if we look down, most of these numbers are fairly large, with one major exception, and that is, immunoglobulin A. Serum IgA, and my lines are not numbered here, but it's very easy to find them.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Q A Q A	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt You, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulins. Immunoglobulins in circulation. It's importance is in what is called mucosal immunity. The mucosal tissue is what lines many of the cavities of the body and surfaces. For example, the lining much of the intestine is a mucosal tissue. Most of the IgA in the body is not found circulating, it's found associated with mucosal tissues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	QAQ A QAQA QA QA	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria. And that's 95 percent certain? 95 percent certain that it's not due to random chance, or a 5 percent chance that it is due to random chance. And - And if we look down, most of these numbers are fairly large, with one major exception, and that is, immunoglobulin A. Serum IgA, and my lines are not numbered here, but it's very easy to find them. And that's the .360 number? No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Q A Q A	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt You, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulins. Immunoglobulins in circulation. It's importance is in what is called mucosal immunity. The mucosal tissue is what lines many of the cavities of the body and surfaces. For example, the lining much of the intestine is a mucosal tissue. Most of the IgA in the body is not found circulating, it's found associated with mucosal tissues. In the digestive tract?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	QAQ A QAQA QA QA	Okay. Statistically, what these numbers mean, treatment is the effect of treatment, and treatment here is exposure to voltage. So, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of significance. Biologists generally want to see a number less than .05 to consider it statistically significant. You're talking about P values? P values, that is what these numbers are. Maybe for the record, why don't you just explain what P value is? P value is a messure of statistical significance. It ranges from zero to 1. And, although I'm not a statistician, so my interpretation here might not be exactly what a statistician would give, it is generally considered the probability of being wrong if you say there's a difference between two treatments. So, we want that number to be small. .05. .05 is often used as the criteria. And that's 95 percent certain? 95 percent certain that it's not due to random chance, or a 5 percent chance that it is due to random chance. And - And if we look down, most of these numbers are fairly large, with one major exception, and that is, immunoglobulin A. Serum IgA, and my lines are not numbered here, but it's very easy to find them.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Q A Q A	I've always I'll let you finish the question. MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. THE REPORTER: Wait until he finishes his question. I don't mind if you interrupt me and Mr. Lawrence, but it makes it hard on Mr. Kirby, and he's an old man, and we try and go easy on him. I'm sorry. I've never done this before, so if I do something wrong, let me know. Just do your best not to interrupt Mr. Lawrence or I, and we'll do our best not to interrupt You, okay? Okay. Now, biological significance. There were two observations, IL1 and IL2, that were close to significant statistically. The one that was significant was IgA. Now, an important part in interpreting these data is to know what IgA actually is. Ig stands for immunoglobulin. That's effectively is an antibody. The major immuno- globulin that circulates in blood is the immunoglobulins. Immunoglobulins in circulation. It's importance is in what is called mucosal immunity. The mucosal tissue is what lines many of the cavities of the body and surfaces. For example, the lining much of the intestine is a mucosal tissue. Most of the IgA in the body is not found circulating, it's found associated with mucosal tissues.

Sta		lends, et al.	iiiic .	1	March 14, 2014
		Page 13			Page 15
1		lungs, the lining of the mammary gland, the lining of the	1		some modification, a very common thing, maybe generally
2		genital urinary tract, and so forth.	2		acceptable, but they have some questions, or is not
3	Q		3		acceptable for publication in that it doesn't meet some
4	×	contact with antigens?	4		of the criteria.
5	А	Yes. Those surfaces. So, where you would expect to find	5	0	Does the validity or accuracy of the conclusions or
6		large amounts of IgA would be in lymphoid tissue, that is	6	×	findings have anything to do with the function of the
7		immune system tissue associated with surfaces, and	7		reviewers?
8		secreted into the - sometimes into the secretions from		А	I'm not sure what you mean by validity or accuracy.
9		these surfaces. So, a major question is whether the	9		How about, let me restate it. Is there ever a situation
10		Serum IgA reflects the change in mucosal immunity or not.	10	×	where the reviewers say the experimentation, the data,
11		And I don't know the answer to that. It doesn't	11		simply doesn't support the conclusion?
12		necessarily reflect a change in mucosal immunity. One		Δ	Yes. If, as an example, if you do an experiment, you
13		could certainly imagine seeing no change in IgA or a	13	11	observe a certain observation, and you make inferences
14		change in Serum IgA that isn't reflective of mucosal	14		far beyond what your data will actually support, yes,
15		immunity. It suggests a possibility. It doesn't	15		that comment can be made.
16		establish it to a biological certainty.	16	0	
17	Q	So, if you were going to attempt to draw any conclusions	17	X	tion?
18	X	to a reasonable degree of biological certainty, these		А	That was my opinion.
19		data don't enable you to do that?	19		By the way, what's a Type 1 error?
20		MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading.			I know the answer, I'm trying to think of how to explain
21		Go head.	21		it to you.
22	Α	Very rarely do you see a single study in which you can	22	Q	
23	11	say something to certainty. I'll start with that. I	23		
24		would suggest that - it suggests the possibility that	24	11	something in a very long time, I have to think of it
25		further work might be worth doing, but it doesn't	25		before I get into this.
26		establish a change in mucosal immunity.	26	Q	
27	0	And ultimately you decided that these data were not			I will use this experiment as an example. We had, for
28	×	significant enough or not certain enough to warrant	28	11	each of these measurements, we had two groups, control
29		publication, you and Dr. Reinemann?	29		and treated. If I - I can make two decisions. The
30		MR. LAWRENCE: Objection to form. Leading.	30		control and the treated are the same, they're equal, or I
00					control and the dediced are the sume, they to equal, of t
		Page 14			Page 16
1			1		Ŭ
1	A	Go ahead.	1		can decide that they're different. There is a truth,
2	A	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know	2		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are
2 3	A	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on	2 3		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then
2 3 4	A	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I	2 3 4		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect.
2 3 4 5	A	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it	2 3 4 5		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're
2 3 4 5 6		Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint.	2 3 4 5 6		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't
2 3 4 5 6 7	A Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a	2 3 4 5 6 7		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're the same when I really should have said they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	0	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made, appropriate controls, whether, statistically, whether the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying treatment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made, appropriate controls, whether, statistically, whether the experiment was big enough, for example, did you use	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're the same when I really should have said they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying treatment. But there can be pre-treatment differences between two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made, appropriate controls, whether, statistically, whether the experiment was big enough, for example, did you use enough animals?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're the same when I really should have said they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying treatment. But there can be pre-treatment differences between two groups of animals that are going to affect the end
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made, appropriate controls, whether, statistically, whether the experiment was big enough, for example, did you use enough animals? And something that is a little harder, at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're the same when I really should have said they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying treatment. But there can be pre-treatment differences between two groups of animals that are going to affect the end results after the treatment, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made, appropriate controls, whether, statistically, whether the experiment was big enough, for example, did you use enough animals? And something that is a little harder, at least for me to get a grasp on, and that is, the signifi-	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're the same when I really should have said they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying treatment. But there can be pre-treatment differences between two groups of animals that are going to affect the end results after the treatment, is that correct? That's possible, yes.
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	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made, appropriate controls, whether, statistically, whether the experiment was big enough, for example, did you use enough animals? And something that is a little harder, at least for me to get a grasp on, and that is, the signifi- cance of the finding; does it actually change the way we	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 Q A	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're the same when I really should have said they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying treatment. But there can be pre-treatment differences between two groups of animals that are going to affect the end results after the treatment, is that correct? That's possible, yes. And what did you do to ensure that, in your initial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made, appropriate controls, whether, statistically, whether the experiment was big enough, for example, did you use enough animals? And something that is a little harder, at least for me to get a grasp on, and that is, the signifi- cance of the finding; does it actually change the way we look at a particular field.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	A Q A	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying treatment. But there can be pre-treatment differences between two groups of animals that are going to affect the end results after the treatment, is that correct? That's possible, yes. And what did you do to ensure that, in your initial study, that the animals' pre-treatment really were the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made, appropriate controls, whether, statistically, whether the experiment was big enough, for example, did you use enough animals? And something that is a little harder, at least for me to get a grasp on, and that is, the signifi- cance of the finding; does it actually change the way we look at a particular field. The reviewers evaluate these. They send a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	A Q A Q	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying treatment. But there can be pre-treatment differences between two groups of animals that are going to affect the end results after the treatment, is that correct? That's possible, yes. And what did you do to ensure that, in your initial study, that the animals' pre-treatment really were the same?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made, appropriate controls, whether, statistically, whether the experiment was big enough, for example, did you use enough animals? And something that is a little harder, at least for me to get a grasp on, and that is, the signifi- cance of the finding; does it actually change the way we look at a particular field. The reviewers evaluate these. They send a report as, in my experience, always anonymously, back to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	A Q A Q	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're the same when I really should have said they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying treatment. But there can be pre-treatment differences between two groups of animals that are going to affect the end results after the treatment, is that correct? That's possible, yes. And what did you do to ensure that, in your initial study, that the animals' pre-treatment really were the same? The initial study, the first thing that's done in any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Q	Go ahead. I do not know Dr. Reinemann's opinions. I only know mine. So I can't speak to Dr. Reinemann's opinions on this. I was not very excited about publishing it. I wouldn't object to publishing it, but I did not think it was a particularly exciting study from that standpoint. In the scientific community, what does it mean to have a paper peer reviewed? The most scientific journals have an editorial board, and when a paper is submitted to those journals for possible publication, it is sent to reviewers who are, in the judgment of the editor at least, sufficiently expert in the subject matter of the paper to pass judgment on whether it meets that journal's criteria for publication. It varies considerably with a journal as to what that might mean. Some of the things that are typically evaluated are novelty of work. Is it reporting something that hasn't been reported before? Appropriate methodology, whether the right measures were made, appropriate controls, whether, statistically, whether the experiment was big enough, for example, did you use enough animals? And something that is a little harder, at least for me to get a grasp on, and that is, the signifi- cance of the finding; does it actually change the way we look at a particular field. The reviewers evaluate these. They send a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	A Q A Q	can decide that they're different. There is a truth, they either really are the same or they really are different. Now, if I say that they're the same, then they really are the same, there's no treatment effect. Then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're different, and they're really different, then I haven't made a mistake. If I say they're the same, but they're really different, that is an error. And if I say that they're different, but they're really the same, that's also an error. But those two errors aren't the same. If I say they are different when, in fact, they're really the same, that's called a Type 1 error. And if I say they're different, that's called a Type 2 error. So you're focusing on the pre-treatment conditions of the animals to be able to make a valid comparison between the control and the treatment group? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. No. We're focusing on the differences after applying treatment. But there can be pre-treatment differences between two groups of animals that are going to affect the end results after the treatment, is that correct? That's possible, yes. And what did you do to ensure that, in your initial study, that the animals' pre-treatment really were the same?

	Blends, et al.			March 14, 2014
	Page 17			Page 19
1	12 highest milk production cows and call them a control	1	۸	I believe he was referring to this (indicating).
1	in 12 lowest ones, treatment. Where they're housed in			No, no. Part 3.
2	the barn is random, for example. We don't house all of			Oh. Okay. This is the same - that is this (indicating).
3				This is just a different summary of this.
4	the treatment group together and all of the control group together in case there's some local environmental	4		
5	together, in case there's some local environmental effect.	5	· ·	This is what was submitted to the Minnesota Public
6	So that's the first thing, and probably the			
7		7		Utilities. This wasn't. (All indicating).
8	most important in any experiment, is the randomization	8	Ŷ	But 250 is just a different compilation 250 is a different compilation.
9	part. The second, in this initial study, is a	9		of 249?
10	technique called analysis of co-variance. Analysis of		_	
11			A	
12	co-variance makes a measurement at the start of the			Go ahead.
13	experiment. It doesn't have to be the same as what	13	A	To the best of my knowledge, that is true. And at the time 250 was submitted to the Minnesota
14	you're measuring later, but it can be; and statistically	14		
15	correct for any difference there between the two, the	16		Science Advisory, you're indicated to be a professor of dairy science?
16	groups. It's mostly the measure of actually			dairy science? That is correct.
17	reducing variability. And I'm not a statistician, so I'm			
18	hoping that makes sense. But that's the best I can do.			And Dr. Reinemann was just an associate professor?
19 20 (20	A	That's what this says, and I don't recall, but that's
20 Q			Ω	what it says.
21	outcomes? Correct.	21	Q	And Steve LeMire, he was the guy who was in charge of the statistics?
	And in the study, the Part 3 of the Minnesota Science			He was in charge of the statistics. I don't know if he
23 Q 24	Advisory, that also looked for a number of outcomes?	24		did other things as well, but that's correct.
	Correct.			What did Morten Dam Rasmussen, PhD, do?
	And in the unpublished abstract that you did, that looked			He was an associate of Dr. Reinemann's, and I'm not quite
20 0	for scores of outcomes?	27		sure. Dr. Reinemann felt his name should be associated
28 A		28		with it, I do not know why.
	Have you ever heard of statistically the Bonferioni			What about Milo Wiltbank?
30	Adjustment?			Milo Wiltbank did some of the assays. I believe the
20	rajustnent.	00	••	while without and some of the ussays. Toolleve the
	Dage 19			Page 20
	Page 18			Page 20
1	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni?	1		Page 20 assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol.
2 A	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni?	1		assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l.
2 A 3 Q	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni.			assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are?
2 A 3 Q 4 A	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes.	2	Q	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s?
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies?	2 3 4	Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements.
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not.	2 3 4	Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay.	2 3 4 5	Q A Q	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those?
2 A 3 C 4 A 5 C 6 A 7 C 8 A 9 C 10 A 11 C	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249?	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 13 A 14	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons.
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 13 A 14 15	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 13 A 14 15 16	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 13 A 14 15 16 17	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response?
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or SO.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 Q 19 Q	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them
2 A 3 C 4 A 5 C 6 A 7 C 8 A 9 C 10 A 11 C 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 C 20 A	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses? Different messenger RNAs. Not all of them were related	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them stimulate certain activities, some of them inhibit
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 Q 20 A 21	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses? Different messenger RNAs. Not all of them were related to immune responses. We included some that we were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them stimulate certain activities, some of them inhibit certain activities. For example, there are pathways that
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 Q 20 A 21 22	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses? Different messenger RNAs. Not all of them were related to immune responses. We included some that we were pretty sure wouldn't see an effect as a control for that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them stimulate certain activities, some of them inhibit certain activities. For example, there are pathways that stimulate antibody production, there are pathways that
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 Q 20 A 21 22 23	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses? Different messenger RNAs. Not all of them were related to immune responses. We included some that we were pretty sure wouldn't see an effect as a control for that. We also included some things that we shouldn't have even	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them stimulate certain activities, some of them inhibit certain activities. For example, there are pathways that stimulate antibody production, there are pathways that inhibit antibody production.
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 Q 20 A 21 22 23 24	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses? Different messenger RNAs. Not all of them were related to immune responses. We included some that we were pretty sure wouldn't see an effect as a control for that. We also included some things that we shouldn't have even seen in the cells to make sure that we weren't detecting	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q A Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them stimulate certain activities, some of them inhibit certain activities. For example, there are pathways that stimulate antibody production. Not being an immunologist, I am not quite
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 Q 20 A 21 22 23 24 25	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses? Different messenger RNAs. Not all of them were related to immune responses. We included some that we were pretty sure wouldn't see an effect as a control for that. We also included some things that we shouldn't have even seen in the cells to make sure that we weren't detecting spurious signals. Does that answer - is that an answer	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q A Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them stimulate certain activities, some of them inhibit certain activities. For example, there are pathways that stimulate antibody production. Not being an immunologist, I am not quite sure how to answer that, but I'm not sure I would say
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 Q 20 A 21 22 23 24 25 26	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses? Different messenger RNAs. Not all of them were related to immune responses. We included some that we were pretty sure wouldn't see an effect as a control for that. We also included some things that we shouldn't have even seen in the cells to make sure that we weren't detecting spurious signals. Does that answer - is that an answer to your question?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q A Q A Q A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them stimulate certain activities, some of them inhibit certain activities. For example, there are pathways that stimulate antibody production. Not being an immunologist, I am not quite sure how to answer that, but I'm not sure I would say that it's quite as simple as a protein is always either
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 20 A 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 Q	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses? Different messenger RNAs. Not all of them were related to immune responses. We included some that we were pretty sure wouldn't see an effect as a control for that. We also included some things that we shouldn't have even seen in the cells to make sure that we weren't detecting spurious signals. Does that answer - is that an answer to your question? Yes. Well, let me just ask you this. Exhibit number	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Q A Q A A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them stimulate certain activities, some of them inhibit certain activities. For example, there are pathways that stimulate antibody production. Not being an immunologist, I am not quite sure how to answer that, but I'm not sure I would say that it's quite as simple as a protein is always either one or always the other.
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 11 Q 12 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 Q 20 A 21 22 23 24 25 26 Q 27 Q 28	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses? Different messenger RNAs. Not all of them were related to immune responses. We included some that we were pretty sure wouldn't see an effect as a control for that. We also included some things that we shouldn't have even seen in the cells to make sure that we weren't detecting spurious signals. Does that answer - is that an answer to your question? Yes. Well, let me just ask you this. Exhibit number 250. Do you have a copy?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Q A Q A A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them stimulate certain activities, some of them inhibit certain activities. For example, there are pathways that stimulate antibody production. Not being an immunologist, I am not quite sure how to answer that, but I'm not sure I would say that it's quite as simple as a protein is always either one or always the other. And if you look at the abstract of 250, the last sentence
2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 A 11 Q 12 A 11 Q 12 A 14 15 16 17 18 20 A 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 Q	MR. LAWRENCE: Do you mean Bonferioni? Bonferioni? Bonferioni. Yes. You didn't use those in these studies? I do not know that I used them for these studies or not. Okay. I have heard of it though. So you didn't do the statistics, is that correct, doctor? That's correct. What was the next project that you did relating to bovine immune systems after 249? Okay. That was the study looking specifically at messenger RNA reference. When we started this, we thought it would be technically feasible to make very large numbers of measurements. We were able to get measurements on a reasonable number around the hundred or so. Of different immune responses? Different messenger RNAs. Not all of them were related to immune responses. We included some that we were pretty sure wouldn't see an effect as a control for that. We also included some things that we shouldn't have even seen in the cells to make sure that we weren't detecting spurious signals. Does that answer - is that an answer to your question? Yes. Well, let me just ask you this. Exhibit number 250. Do you have a copy? Yes, I have a copy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Q A Q A A	assays he did were the assays for the hormone cortisol. C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l. Why don't you explain for the record what assays are? A-s-s-a-y-s? Correct. Measurements. And there is a certain number of - at least in exhibit 250, there were a certain number of indicators or markers of the immune's function response that were identified for observation and testing. Why did you identify and test those? They are often used in immunology to assess immune function. They are accessible, meaning they were things we had the ability to actually assay. Those were the major reasons. When we talk about immune response, are there two types of proteins and cells, those that stimulate an immune response and those that control an immune response? There are many proteins in the body that affect the immune response. Affect spelled with an A. Some of them stimulate certain activities, some of them inhibit certain activities. For example, there are pathways that stimulate antibody production. Not being an immunologist, I am not quite sure how to answer that, but I'm not sure I would say that it's quite as simple as a protein is always either one or always the other.

March 14, 2014
Page 23
 1 A That's correct. 2 Q And that's the best way to do it, isn't it? 3 A That is a powerful way of doing it. I don't know if I 4 would say it's the best. There are many possible ways, 5 but that certainly is a way of reducing the variability. 6 Q It is a more powerful way of reducing variability than to 7 just compare the test group to the control group after 8 the test is completed with no baseline comparison? 9 A Under most situations, that's correct. It would be - it 10 is technically possible that that's not correct, but 11 those situations would be pretty rare. 12 Q The second last sentence in the last full paragraph on 13 page 2 says, "The absence of significant changes in these 14 laboratory data in treatment cattle over time (each cow 15 serving as her own control), as well as a lack of 16 difference between treatment and control cows, indicate 17 there was no alteration in circulating volume or 18 acid-base balance, nor was there significant stress (as 19 meausred by glucose concentration) or muscle injury 20 inflicted by the treatment." Are you talking there - or 21 is the author there talking about the testing you did or 22 testing that had been done? 23 A I believe - let me read the whole paragraph for a moment 24 to put it in context. 25 Q All right. 26 A I believe that is referring to this study cited 27 Reinemann, et al, 1996, which is in the references of 28 this. 29 Q Okay. 30 A That is not referring to this particular study.
Page 24
 1 Q If you look on page 3 under Objectives, that was the objective of the study that's reflected by this paper? 3 A Excuse me? 4 Q Page 3, where it says Objectives, that was what this study hoped to accomplish, by this study that's reflected by exhibit 250? 7 A That, referring to the immune function? 8 Q Yes. 9 A Correct. 10 Q And do you agree with me that the stress that an animal is subjected to, is, in part, related to herd management? 12 A Yes. 13 Q And the way one group of cows might be treated, if it was different than the way another group of cows is treated, you might expect to see different stress responses? 16 A Could you repeat that? 17 Q Yes. If you had two herds, and their daily protocol, their daily management, was different, one would expect to see different stress responses in those two different herds? 21 A That's certainly possible. 22 Q And on the bottom of page 3, the last paragraph on the bottom of page 3 talks about how this herd was managed. 24 A Okay. Yes. 25 Q And it wouldn't be appropriate to draw necessarily a comparison between this management style and a completely different management style? 28 A (No response). 29 Q It looks like you're struggling with the question.

Star Blends, et al.	March 14, 2014
Page 25	Page 27
 understand the question correctly, you're asking, can we extend the results from this study, which was done in a stanchion barn, UW Madison herd, their particular genetics and so forth. Q Milk two times a day? A Milked twice a day, fed a certain type of ration. Q May or may not have been administered BST, we don't know that. A I do not recall when UW started using BST. MR. LAWRENCE: I'll straighten that out. I don't mean to interrupt, but it's discussed in a lot of the page 3 also, if that helps. A The extent to which these results could be extended to other herds. Basic biology is still constant. I mean, there are certain principles of biology that can be extended. Certainly it limits some types of responses. For example, if you are - and I believe there is research to support this, although it has been a long time since I looked at it, an animal that is housed in such a way that it can't avoid a stress. Q So, extrapolating that, an animal in a free stall barn that can avoid a stress is going to have less stress than an animal in a stanchion barn where the stress is administered? MR. LAWRENCE: I'll object to the form as leading. Go ahead. A There are some studies that would suggest that, if I remember the literature correctly. To state that that's 	 levels, if you put the sample in the freezer and do the analysis at anytime. But some of these tests require living tissue collected from the cow, and they take several days to actually conduct. That timing allowed us the opportunity to collect the sample, process it and then go back and collect and process the next sample. We simply didn't have the personnel to, for example, take twice daily samples and process all of that for some of the assays that we were doing, like chemiluminescence in the lymphocite blastogenesis assay, in particular, are vary laborious assays. Q On page 9, are those data the same data that were in 249? Because I noticed it in IgA serum, the mean difference is .017 rather than .015. A I believe that it's based on the same row data set, but we did some slight differences in, I think, - I think that is reflected in a statistical difference that was made in how the details of how the statistics were analyzed that makes a slight difference in the exact number. But I - it does appear that these should have been the same data. There was only one data set with all of this. What's in this first report may have been analyzed by a slightly different technique, and so the numbers may show very small differences, like the difference between .017 and .015. Q But just from looking at, with my rudimentary understanding of P-values and statistics, there isn't anything in the far righthand column that's less than
Page 26	Page 28
 always true I think is a bit of an overstatement. So. Q It could be true? A It could be true, but I wouldn't say it is true. Q You wouldn't say it's always true? A I wouldn't say it's always true? A I wouldn't say it's always true? Q All right. Then, on Page 4, the bottom of the last paragraph says, "The differences of the treatment cows were compared to the differences of the control cows using and independent t-test." What's a t-test? A It is a statistical method of determining significance. O On Page 6, how is it determined when the blood samples were collected? The samples were collected A Are you referring here to the duration of - I'm not sure what exactly you're referring to. Q It says, "Samples were collected for one week before exposure and for the two weeks of exposure." A Yes. Who decided how and when to collect the blood samples and what to make the comparisons to? I mean, that sounds like more biology than it does engineering. A It does. One of the factors - are you referring here to the duration of the collection, that it was for, say two weeks of treatment, or to the exact date it was collected on? Q The latter. A The latter. Okay. One of the things - let me refresh myself on how often we actually didn't collect these. One aspect of this is, these - some of these assays are quite difficult to conduct. It can't be conducted on stored samples. Some of the things like serum cortisol 	 .05, is there? Well, I guess there is, staph. aureas. A Staphylococcus aureas. I did not do those statistics. So that detailed independent t-test. Okay. Let me see what the difference is. Staphylococcus aureas. I am not sure what that refers to. Q Okay. A That is something that a statistician did that I do not know what that even refers to. Q Take a look at page 13, Conclusion. The conclusion says, "Collectively, these results suggest that exposeure to 1 milliamp of 60 hertz electrical current for two weeks had no significant effect on immune function of dairy cattle." Was that the conclusion of this study? A That would have been the collected conclusion of the authors in the study. Q And you were one of the authors? A I was one of the authors. There is, like I said, the one observation that was significant. Q Now, 251 is your abstract? A That's correct. Q Is that the next research that was done on this subject matter? A That I was involved in, that's correct. Q And why was this abstract never published, Dr. Sheffield? A I had - for basically the same reasons as the first. The study had not shown a lot of significant effects, and I doubted it would stand peer review. Q Why did you doubt that it would stand peer review? A By the time - when we started this study, the technology we were trying to use was in its infancy.

Star Blends, et al.	March 14, 2014
Page 29	Page 31
 1 Q A ray analyzer? 2 A Yes. 3 Q Did you have a lot of trouble with that? 4 A Yes. As we progressed through this, some of the things that we would liked to have done were technically not feasible, at least not at the time with the technology that we had available. 8 Q The ray analyzer was a new 9 A It was a very new technology and it really had not been applied to cattle at the time. 11 Q And the notes, underlying notes, seems to suggest that your lab assistant had some difficulty using that technology? 14 A That's correct. 15 Q And you heard of the expression, garbage in, garbage out? 16 A Yes. 17 Q And there's some aspect of garbage in, garbage out in the data that were generated, is that correct? 19 MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leading. 20 A I don't know if I would say in the data that were generated. The - well, I'll just say that. 22 Q Well, is there some reason to believe that the underlying data that were suspect because of the new technology and the unfamiliarity of the people who were applying that new technology? 26 A I think the data included here are as reliable as we could have made them. 28 Q I understand that. I know that 	 have been attributed to false positives as they could be to the effects of the administration of A I don't know if I MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Go ahead. A I don't know if I would say just as likely, but it could be. Q And you also said there could be a Type 1 error in the data that you generated? A I probably said that in the caveats here somewhere. That sounds like something that would be in here. Q And again, this was in a stanchion barn? A Correct. Q And unlike exposure in a real life situation, you essentially attached electrodes to the legs of the animals so they were constantly administered electric current? A Correct. Q They couldn't avoid it? A Not without physically detaching the electrodes by rubbing against the stanchion. Q Did that happen? A Well, we did check those. Each time the cows were milked, that got checked. You will occasionally - we would on occasion see the electrodes detached. They were immediately repaired. But, in general, they did stay in place. Q And in the last paragraph on the second page, first sentence, it says, "In a previous study." Is that
28 Q I understand that. I know that	sentence, it says, "In a previous study." Is that
29 A You're asking me about technical abilities. Certainly,30 today there are much better ways of doing it than what we	referring to the study that you and Dr. Reinemann did?It says, "In a previous study, we observed that
Page 30	Page 32
 did. Q I'm not suggesting A By today's standards, the results would be very noisy. Q By the way, was there any observation in the work that you and Dr. Reinemann did before exhibit 251 of a drop-off in milk production or an adverse effects on animal health associated with the administration of electrical currents to the animals? A We did not notice any change in milk production. Q And is that true go ahead. A And, well, you asked also about animal health. The numbers would have been pretty small to have detected any health effects at all. Q And is that true with the animals in the experiment of 251, no drop-off in milk production? A I do not recall any. Q Now, in the abstract, the last sentence says, "These results suggest that electrical effects on disease processes are likely to be word difficult to detect in small samples." Was that the conclusion of this study? A That's what I would have concluded, yes. Perhaps I should define modest, meaning, we basically found, out of a hundred genes, only a couple of things were actually different that we could detect at all, and when you're doing the hundred statistical test, you expect a certain number of false results. Q False positives? A Yes. Q So, some of the results that you see could just as likely 	 electrical exposure of dairy cattle had minimal effect on most immune function measures, including chemiluminescence, lympho - how do you pronounce it? A Lymphocyte blastogenesis, is how it's pronounced. Q So that was A That refers to the previous study that we've just discussed, yes. Q All right. And you're talking about interleukin 1 approached significance of less than .01, but I thought statistical significance was less than .05. A Where do you see this? Next sentence. "Increase in serum interleukin 1 approached significance at P of less than .01." A No10. Q Excuse me10. A That is greater than .05. That's why we say "approached" rather than "reached." Q So that could be attributable to chance? A Anything can be attributable to chance. It's more likely to be chance than if it were a smaller number. That's what that means. Q In your business, .05 is what's regarded A Most - excuse me. You're correct. Most biologists consider .05 to be, for lack of a better word, the gold standard. Q And it says underneath the animals, so the CALSIACUC, that makes sure you're not abusing the animals? A That's correct. I served on that committee, so, if you want, I could discuss for you what they do. But that's a short version and accurate enough.

		icius, et al.			March 14, 2014
		Page 33			Page 35
_	\mathbf{c}	Dottom line is you're not alestretime the set 1.0	-		Dut the abanage that if you'll be able to flip it -
		Bottom line is, you're not electrocuting the animals?	1		But the chances that if you'll be able to flip it a
2	А	That's correct. If we had tried to give them a voltage	2		hundred times, it'll come up tails becomes less and less?
3		that the committee felt was truly dangerous, for example,	3	А	I don't know if that's a good analogy or not. But.
4		we're going to use 110 volt 20 amps, which is quite	4	Q	But the point is, one of the reasons the Bonferioni, if
5		serious stress.	5	-	I'm pronouncing that correctly, the adjustment is, is
6	\mathbf{O}	Probably wouldn't get the assignment.	6		taking into consideration that possibility?
	X	You probably wouldn't get the approval to do that. But		۸	
7	A	You probably wouldn't get the approval to do that. But	7	A	Yes. Now, that is a major issue in statistics anytime
8	~	that is what they assess, yes.	8		you're making mini comparisons. And the Bonferioni
9	Q		9		approach - again, I'm not a statistician, but I think I'm
10		the mice and the rats?	10		getting this close to right. The critical question is,
11	А	Well, the college of agriculture's committee isn't the	11		what should the Type 1 error rate be based on? Each
12		one that does that. But there is a committee that does.	12		individual comparison for the whole experiment. And
13		Any vertebrae animal research goes through such a	13		there's great debate, at least in my understanding, among
14	0	committee at the University of Wisconsin.	14		statisticians about how to correctly do those
15	Q		15		corrections. The Bonferioni is one approach. Some
16	А	I wouldn't comment on that.	16		statisticians criticize it by saying it over-corrects.
17		MR. LAWRENCE: If you ask if that's true in	17		But that is the idea of the Bonferioni approach, is to
18		Harry Harlow's days, it was.	18		correct that.
	Α	These laws are more recent than Dr. Harlow's work. His	19	Q	
20	••	work would not have been subjected to that.	20	×	errors, when you were studying dozens of outcomes and
		MR. LAWRENCE: Thank you.			only three or four showed it's a statistically
21	0		21		
22	Q	Then you say underneath Animals, "Blood samples was	22		significant difference, that could be due to chance?
23		collected - probably should be were collected - via the	23	А	
24		tail vein immediately prior to applying the current and	24		due to chance when you've got a large number of
25		at a the end of a three week exposure period." So you	25		comparisons and a small number of significant results.
26		took two blood samples, one at the beginning and one at		0	
27		the end?	27	×	outcome?
28	А	That's correct.	28	Δ	I don't know. Many scientific studies, at least in large
	-			11	
29	Q	How come your data doesn't reveal anywhere what the blood	29		animals, look for multiple outcomes. So, I guess I don't
30		samples showed at the beginning of the test?	30		know if I would have an opinion on that one way or the
		Page 34			Page 26
		Page 34			Page 36
1	Α	-	1		Ű
	~	I do not know.	1		other.
2	A Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test	2	Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In
2 3	Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group?	2 3	Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts
2 3 4	Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did.	2 3 4	Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact
2 3 4 5	Q A Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison?	2 3	Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you
2 3 4 5	Q A Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did.	2 3 4	Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact
2 3 4 5	Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that.	2 3 4 5 6	Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you
2 3 4 5 6	Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q A Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A Q A Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q A Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign - Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign - Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A Q A Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign - Yes. - entity into the animal.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A Q A Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign - Yes. - entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign - Yes. - entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P value or Type 1 error P value of .05, there's a 5 percent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to what you would expect to see if the cow were truly ill.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P value or Type 1 error P value of .05, there's a 5 percent chance to be wrong. If I measure two things, there's a 5	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q AQA QAQA	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to what you would expect to see if the cow were truly ill. For example, if you gave the cow a strong vaccine, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P value or Type 1 error P value of .05, there's a 5 percent change of each one, of either one. So, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to what you would expect to see if the cow were truly ill. For example, if you gave the cow a strong vaccine, you would expect to see bigger changes than this in at least
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 A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P value or Type 1 error P value of .05, there's a 5 percent change of each one, of either one. So, the chance that at least one of them is a Type 1 error goes	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 A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to what you would expect to see if the cow were truly ill. For example, if you gave the cow a strong vaccine, you would expect to see bigger changes that that's what that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P value or Type 1 error P value of .05, there's a 5 percent change of each one, of either one. So, the chance that at least one of them is a Type 1 error goes up. The more things you measure, the greater the chance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to what you would expect to see if the cow were truly ill. For example, if you gave the cow a strong vaccine, you would expect to see bigger changes than this in at least some of the immune function measures. That's what that's referring to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P value or Type 1 error P value of .05, there's a 5 percent change of each one, of either one. So, the chance that at least one of them is a Type 1 error goes up. The more things you measure, the greater the chance that at least one of them will show a difference even	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to what you would expect to see if the cow were truly ill. For example, if you gave the cow a strong vaccine, you would expect to see bigger changes than this in at least some of the immune function measures. That's what that's referring to. So, if what you were observing was biologically
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P value or Type 1 error P value of .05, there's a 5 percent change of each one, of either one. So, the chance that at least one of them is a Type 1 error goes up. The more things you measure, the greater the chance that at least one of them will show a difference even though it wasn't really there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign - Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to what you would expect to see if the cow were truly ill. For example, if you gave the cow a strong vaccine, you would expect to see bigger changes than this in at least some of the immune function measures. That's what that's referring to. So, if what you were observing was biologically significant as opposed to statistically significant, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P value or Type 1 error P value of .05, there's a 5 percent change of each one, of either one. So, the chance that at least one of them is a Type 1 error goes up. The more things you measure, the greater the chance that at least one of them will show a difference even though it wasn't really there. Kind of like, if you flip a coin a hundred times, every	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Q AQA QAQA Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to what you would expect to see if the cow were truly ill. For example, if you gave the cow a strong vaccine, you would expect to see bigger changes than this in at least some of the immune function measures. That's what that's referring to. So, if what you were observing was biologically significant as opposed to statistically significant, you would expect to see a much greater reaction.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I do not know. Your comparison is between the control group and the test group? That is the comparison we did. No cow to cow - within cow comparison? No, as I recall, we did not do that. And then, if you look at, it's not numbered, but the next page, under Results and Discussion. Are you with me? I'm with you, yes. You said, "Most measures were not affected, suggesting that those that were could be Type 1 errors, due to a large number of hypotheses tested." What do you mean by that, doctor? You mentioned earlier - well, I guess you explained it. If you measure one thing and you have a Type 1 error of 5 percent, there's a 5 percent chance that if you measured the conclusion, that there's a difference, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong. Follow me so far? I think so. If I'm measuring one thing, let's say milk production, and I should conclude milk production was changed at a P value or Type 1 error P value of .05, there's a 5 percent change of each one, of either one. So, the chance that at least one of them is a Type 1 error goes up. The more things you measure, the greater the chance that at least one of them will show a difference even though it wasn't really there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Q AQA QAQA Q	other. Now, on the last page of your report, you say, "In conclusion, these studies suggest that electrical impacts on immune function are of relatively small impact compared with infection and inflammation." What are you saying there, doctor? All right. Good question. All my questions are good. This is important. Let's suppose we took a cow and, whether intentionally or unintentionally, gave her something that the immune system recognizes as poor, this happens with vaccination, for example, if you give her a vaccine or intentionally give an infection. That's what a vaccine is, is introducing a foreign - Yes. entity into the animal. The immune system responds very strongly to these. When that happens, you see major changes in the immune functions, much larger than what we saw here. And that's what I was referring to there. The magnitude of the changes that we did see are generally small compared to what you would expect to see if the cow were truly ill. For example, if you gave the cow a strong vaccine, you would expect to see bigger changes than this in at least some of the immune function measures. That's what that's referring to. So, if what you were observing was biologically significant as opposed to statistically significant, you

	Biends, et al.	March 14, 20	
	Page 37	Page 3	39
1	Go head.	1 there's a difference, you might be wrong. That's th	
2	A Not necessarily. And here is the reason - well, a reason	2 Type 1 error. The Type 2 error is also important, that	it
3	for this, and a weakness of this study, by the way. So		
4	I'm kind of being critical of myself, but I think you		
5	should do that. This study measures base line responses,		er
6	what the base line is. These cows were, as far as we		
7	knew, healthy. They weren't being exposed to any known	7 To have a low Type 1 error depends on	
8	pathogens other than the things that's normally in their	8 several factors. One is, it depends on how big an effe	ct
9	environment.	9 you're looking for. If I want to see something with a 1	
	An important thing to remember about the	10 percent change, that's going to be the larger Type	
10			I
11	immune system, you don't really want the immune system to	11 error than if I'm looking for 10 volt change.	
12	be active all the time, because it's very damaging.	12 Another thing that influences Type 1 error	
13	Inflammation is very damaging, but it's also very	13 is what you said calls significant, what your P value is	s.
14	beneficial because it gets rid of infections.	14 Most biologists use .05.	
15	What we didn't look at in this study was	15 Q Even .05, there's a 5 percent chance of being wrong	2
			•
16	how strongly and rapidly the immune system responds to a		
17	challenge. So, what we looked at was, you got a base		
18	line here, and that base line didn't change.	18 you would see that big a difference by random chance) .
19	A second important question that we didn't		
20	assess was, if you give a challenge, a vaccine or a		
			.t
21	disease, would the immune system respond strongly or		ι
22	would in one group the response be less than the other		
23	group? So, what's not assessed here is that ability of		
24	the immune system to respond to a challenge. But in	24 reliably you can say that there is no difference when yo	
25	terms of base line, we didn't see, except for, I believe	25 make that conclusion. And that's what takes larg	
26	it was IgA, we did see a drop in the IgA message. But		
			u
27	other than that, the base lines were the same.	27 here.	
28	Q So, is there sufficient or insufficient data here to be	28 If you wanted to study disease, if I take	
29	able to draw any conclusions to a reasonable degree of	29 dozen animals and look at an instance of a particula	
30	scientific certainty about the animal's immune systems	30 disease, I'm probably not going to find any difference	,
			ĺ
	Dest 20	Deer	10
	Page 38	Page 4	10
1			
1	ability to respond to an insult?	1 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere	ly
2	ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an 	ly d
2 3	ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study.	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg 	ly d
2	ability to respond to an insult?A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study.Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. 	ly d e
2 3	ability to respond to an insult?A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study.Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. 	ly d e
2 3 4 5	ability to respond to an insult?A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study.Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators,	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. 	ly d e
2 3 4 5 6	ability to respond to an insult?A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study.Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that 	ly d e at
2 3 4 5 6 7	ability to respond to an insult?A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study.Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an 	ly d e at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ability to respond to an insult?A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study.Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific 	ly d e at y
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ability to respond to an insult?A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study.Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associated 	ly d e at y
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ability to respond to an insult?A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study.Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current?	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific ertainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? 	ly d e at y
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin 	ly d e at y
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin 	ly d e at y ed g.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin A We did not measure a disease itself. That's important to 	ly d e at y ed g. o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin A We did not measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated 	ly d e at y ed g. o to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific ertainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin We did not measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measured 	ly d e at y ed g. o to es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific ertainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin We did not measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that 	ly d e at y ed g. o to es I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific ertainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin We did not measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random 	ly d e at y ed g. o to es I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific ertainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin We did not measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that 	ly d e at y ed g. o to es I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific ertainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin We did not measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. 	ly d e at y ed g. o to es I m
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific ertainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin We did not measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the 	ly d e at y ed g. o to s s I m
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract tha you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific ertainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin We did not measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Now, last topic. You were a full professor at th University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the area 	ly d e at y ed g. o to s s I m
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see something such as, say a change in IgA levels, if you 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin Know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measure a disease. We found most of those measure were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at th University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? 	ly d e at y ed g. o to es I m e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin Know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? 	ly d e at y ed g. o to ss I m e a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more susceptible or less susceptible, depending on what you 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin Know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? A Correct. Q You are now teaching at a junior college in a suburban of 	ly d e at y ed g. o to ss I m e a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more susceptible or less susceptible, depending on what you 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin Know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? A Correct. Q You are now teaching at a junior college in a suburban of 	ly d e at y ed g. o to ss I m e a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more susceptible or less susceptible, depending on what you see, to a disease. To actually study a disease itself 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin Know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? A Correct. Q You are now teaching at a junior college in a suburban co a small town in Wisconsin. How come? 	ly de at y ed g. otoss I m ea a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more susceptible or less susceptible, depending on what you see, to a disease. To actually study a disease itself generally takes a very large number of animals, much 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin Know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? A Correct. Q You are now teaching at a junior college in a suburban of a small town in Wisconsin. How come? A I reached a point in my life where I simply disliked th 	ly de aty d go toss I m e a r e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more susceptible or less susceptible, depending on what you see, to a disease. To actually study a disease itself generally takes a very large number of animals, much larger than what was involved here. 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin Know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? A Correct. Q You are now teaching at a junior college in a suburban of a small town in Wisconsin. How come? A I reached a point in my life where I simply disliked th various stresses associated with doing research and 	lyde at y ed go toes I m ee a or ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more susceptible or less susceptible, depending on what you see, to a disease. To actually study a disease itself generally takes a very large number of animals, much larger than what was involved here. For example, if you look at mastitis, small 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin Know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to randor change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at th University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? A Correct. Q You are now teaching at a junior college in a suburban of a small town in Wisconsin. How come? A I reached a point in my life where I simply disliked th various stresses associated with doing research an wanted to do something that was more pure teachin 	lyde at y ed go toes I m ee a or ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more susceptible or less susceptible, depending on what you see, to a disease. To actually study a disease itself generally takes a very large number of animals, much larger than what was involved here. For example, if you look at mastitis, small studies don't have a lot of what is called statistical 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin Know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the area of mammary gland development? A Correct. Q You are now teaching at a junior college in a suburban of a small town in Wisconsin. How come? A I reached a point in my life where I simply disliked th various stresses associated with doing research an wanted to do something that was more pure teachin Q Got tired of publish or perish? 	lyde at y ed go toss I m le a or e d g.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more susceptible or less susceptible, depending on what you see, to a disease. To actually study a disease itself generally takes a very large number of animals, much larger than what was involved here. For example, if you look at mastitis, small studies don't have a lot of what is called statistical power, and that's what I was trying to get at here, 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract that you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin Know. We measure a disease itself. That's important to know. We measure a some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measures were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to random change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? A Correct. Q You are now teaching at a junior college in a suburban of a small town in Wisconsin. How come? A I reached a point in my life where I simply disliked th various stresses associated with doing research an wanted to do something that was more pure teachin Q Got tired of publish or perish? A And getting grants and various other stresses. My life 	lyde at y ed go toss I m le a or e d g. e,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more susceptible or less susceptible, depending on what you see, to a disease. To actually study a disease itself generally takes a very large number of animals, much larger than what was involved here. For example, if you look at mastitis, small studies don't have a lot of what is called statistical power, and that's what I was trying to get at here, although it probably didn't do a very good job of 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract the you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin know. We measured a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measure were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to randon change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? A Correct. Q You are now teaching at a junior college in a suburban co a small town in Wisconsin. How come? A I reached a point in my life where I simply disliked th various stresses associated with doing research an wanted to do something that was more pure teaching Q Got tired of publish or perish? A And getting grants and various other stresses. My lifi I don't know that the job is any easier, but I find it 	lyde at y d g. otoss I m le a or e d g. e,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	 ability to respond to an insult? A This says very little, if anything, about ability to respond to an insult. It's just a base line study. Q And then you go on to say, "Any effects observed appear to affect only a small set of immune response regulators, compared to most disease processes, which affect a wider spectrum of regulators." Are you saying there that, when you introduce a real disease, there's a much more robust response in the animals than the response you saw to the administration of current? A I think that's what I was trying to say, yes. Q And that you conclude by saying, "As a result, the impacts of electrical exposure on animal health and disease is likely to be difficult to detect reliably, particularly without examining a large population." We need to study a whole lot more animals before we can come to any conclusions. Is that what that means? A Okay. That sentence is referring to disease processes. So. One of the questions that comes up is, even if you see that, will that indicate that this animal is more susceptible or less susceptible, depending on what you see, to a disease. To actually study a disease itself generally takes a very large number of animals, much larger than what was involved here. For example, if you look at mastitis, small studies don't have a lot of what is called statistical power, and that's what I was trying to get at here, 	 simply because 12 animals for most diseases is not mere enough. So, for a study of actual disease instance, an whether something affects that, does take very larg numbers of animals. Q So, is it fair to say, doctor, that, based upon Dr. Reinemann and your joint studies, and the abstract the you did, the data simply isn't sufficient to draw an conclusions to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty about disease effects on animals associate with electricity? MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Leadin know. We measured a disease itself. That's important to know. We measured some things that may be correlated sensitivity to disease. We found most of those measure were unchanged, and a few were changed, few enough that cannot reliably conclude that it's not due to randon change. Q Now, last topic. You were a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, tenured, specialized in the are of mammary gland development? A Correct. Q You are now teaching at a junior college in a suburban co a small town in Wisconsin. How come? A I reached a point in my life where I simply disliked th various stresses associated with doing research an wanted to do something that was more pure teaching Q Got tired of publish or perish? A And getting grants and various other stresses. My lifi I don't know that the job is any easier, but I find in 	lyde at y ed go toss I m le a or e d g. e,

Star Dienus, et al.	Warch 14, 2014
Page 41	Page 43
1 Q So now you're teaching basic biology rather than highly	1 Q Thank you.
2 specialized mammary gland development?	2 A Sorry.
3 A That's correct. Yes. I teach - this semester I'm	3 Q No, the problem was my question, not your answer. I
4 teaching not only Physiology I, mostly to nursing	4 apologize. We get double negatives in this business too
students, Anatomy Physiology I, the microbiology.	5 often.
6 Q Your choice?	6 And could you briefly describe for me your
7 A Yes.	academic training in immunology in terms of course work
8 Q That's all I have.	8 you've taken and the research you've done as it relates
9 MR. LAWRENCE: I have a bunch, doctor.	9 to that subject? And I'm looking for the short version
10 We've been going about an hour and a half. If you'd like	10 of that, a short version.
a break, we can take one, if not, we can go for a while	11 A Well, like any graduate student whose specialty was
12 longer.	12 physiology, I had a reasonable amount of immunology in
13 MR. THORNTON: I have to leave at 3:30 to	13 courses. I was included in a lot of other courses I took
14 catch an airplane.	14 in microbiology and physiology. I have used immuno-
15 A Actually, I'm fine.	15 logical techniques as research tools for some time. Some
16	16 of these assays were new to me, but in terms of actually
17 (At this time a recess was taken - 2:00 to 2:09).	17 doing them I was familiar with what the assays were, but
17 (At this time a recess was taken - 2.00 to 2.07). 18	18 I had not actually performed them before doing this
19 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION	19 study.
20	20 Q The assays involved on Table 2, page 9 of exhibit 250, in
21 BY MR. LAWRENCE:	21 particular, or other ones in the other study?
21 BI MR. LAWRENCE. 22	22 A Well, we'll just talk about these for now. But, yes,
	22 A well, well just talk about these for how. But, yes,23 these I - some of these would have been new assays to me.
 Q Mr. Sheffield, let's go back to exhibit 249 and 250 for a moment, please, and I would like to look at Table 2 on 	24 Q And who actually did the physical work of making the
24 moment, please, and I would like to look at Table 2 on25 those two documents with you for a moment. It's on page	
26 9 in 250, and I'm not sure what page it's on in 249.	 assays? A number of people? Can you describe who they were or what
26 9 in 250, and rin not sure what page it's on in 249.27 A Table 2, you said?	27 A The end is, there's technicians. I believe all of these
	28 were done - this was a very long time period. By
29 MR. THORNTON: I think Table 2 is on page 30 22 of 249.	29 full-time technicians as opposed to graduate students,30 although it might be possible that a graduate student
JU 22 01 247.	30 although it might be possible that a graduate student
Page 42	Page 44
.	
1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I	1 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision.
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines,
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2,
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct?
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct.
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time?
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my laboratory did the actual measurements. 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I 1 think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated 3 on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, 4 let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover 5 this with you in some detail. 6 First of all, and just as background, could 7 you please describe what your major functions were in 8 both designing and carrying out these studies that 9 resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on 10 exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things 12 we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to 13 measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my 14 laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it
 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my laboratory did the actual measurements. Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I 1 think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated 3 on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, 4 let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover 5 this with you in some detail. 6 First of all, and just as background, could 7 you please describe what your major functions were in 8 both designing and carrying out these studies that 9 resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on 10 exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things 12 we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to 13 measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my 14 laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with 16 respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before.
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I 1 think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated 3 on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, 4 let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover 5 this with you in some detail. 6 First of all, and just as background, could 7 you please describe what your major functions were in 8 both designing and carrying out these studies that 9 resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on 10 exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things 12 we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to 13 measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my 14 laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with 16 respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they"
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where messenger RNA assays were used? 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians?
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I 1 think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated 3 on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, 4 let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover 5 this with you in some detail. 6 First of all, and just as background, could 7 you please describe what your major functions were in 8 both designing and carrying out these studies that 9 resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on 10 exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things 12 we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to 13 measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my 14 laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with 16 respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where 19 messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians?
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Generally speaking, do you think these measurements were 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians? A The technicians, yes. Q Thank you. The units for each of the various variables
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Generally speaking, do you think these measurements were done in an appropriate and accurate manner? 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians? A That you. The units for each of the various variables are indicated in parentheses, and it looks like you made,
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I 1 think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated 3 on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, 4 let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover 5 this with you in some detail. 6 First of all, and just as background, could 7 you please describe what your major functions were in 8 both designing and carrying out these studies that 9 resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on 10 exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things 12 we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to 13 measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my 14 laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with 16 respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where 19 messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Generally speaking, do you think these measurements were 21 done in an appropriate and accurate manner? 23 A I think so. 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians? A The technicians, yes. Q Thank you. The units for each of the various variables are indicated in parentheses, and it looks like you made, you or the statistician, made a logarithmic transfer on
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Generally speaking, do you think these measurements were done in an appropriate and accurate manner? 23 A I think so. 24 Q From your discussion with Mr. Thornton this morning 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians? A The technicians, yes. Q Thank you. The units for each of the various variables are indicated in parentheses, and it looks like you made, you or the statistician, made a logarithmic transfer on each of the numbers, is that correct, or transformation -
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Generally speaking, do you think these measurements were done in an appropriate and accurate manner? 23 A I think so. 24 Q From your discussion with Mr. Thornton this morning (sic), I take it you had no responsibility for the 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians? A The technicians, yes. Q Thank you. The units for each of the various variables are indicated in parentheses, and it looks like you made, you or the statistician, made a logarithmic transfer on each of the numbers, is that correct, or transformation - 25 -
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Generally speaking, do you think these measurements were done in an appropriate and accurate manner? 23 A I think so. 24 Q From your discussion with Mr. Thornton this morning (sic), I take it you had no responsibility for the statistical analysis that resulted in Table 2, is that 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians? A The technicians, yes. Q Thank you. The units for each of the various variables are indicated in parentheses, and it looks like you made, you or the statistician, made a logarithmic transfer on each of the numbers, is that correct, or transformation -
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover this with you in some detail. First of all, and just as background, could you please describe what your major functions were in both designing and carrying out these studies that resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Generally speaking, do you think these measurements were done in an appropriate and accurate manner? 23 A I think so. 24 Q From your discussion with Mr. Thornton this morning (sic), I take it you had no responsibility for the statistical analysis that resulted in Table 2, is that correct? 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians? A The technicians, yes. Q Thank you. The units for each of the various variables are indicated in parentheses, and it looks like you made, you or the statistician, made a logarithmic transfer on each of the numbers, is that correct, or transformation - A That's what the other one would refer to, ye. Q That's a referral to natural logarithm?
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I 1 think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated 3 on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, 4 let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover 5 this with you in some detail. 6 First of all, and just as background, could 7 you please describe what your major functions were in 8 both designing and carrying out these studies that 9 resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on 10 exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things 12 we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to 13 measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my 14 laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where 19 messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Generally speaking, do you think these measurements were done in an appropriate and accurate manner? 23 A I think so. 24 Q From your discussion with Mr. Thornton this morning (sic), I take it you had no responsibility for the statistical analysis that resulted in Table 2, is that correct? 28 A No. You are correct. 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians? A The technicians, yes. Q Thank you. The units for each of the various variables are indicated in parentheses, and it looks like you made, you or the statistician, made a logarithmic transfer on each of the numbers, is that correct, or transformation - A That's what the other one would refer to, ye. A That's a logarithm, yes.
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I 1 think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated 3 on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, 4 let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover 5 this with you in some detail. 6 First of all, and just as background, could 7 you please describe what your major functions were in 8 both designing and carrying out these studies that 9 resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on 10 exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things 12 we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to 13 measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my 14 laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Generally speaking, do you think these measurements were done in an appropriate and accurate manner? 23 A I think so. 24 Q From your discussion with Mr. Thornton this morning (sic), I take it you had no responsibility for the statistical analysis that resulted in Table 2, is that correct? 28 A No. You are correct. 29 Q Thank you. 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians? A The technicians, yes. Q Thank you. The units for each of the various variables are indicated in parentheses, and it looks like you made, you or the statistician, made a logarithmic transfer on each of the numbers, is that correct, or transformation
 1 Q Okay. Then get the same table out from exhibit 249. I 1 think that was the - it is page 9, originally paginated 3 on the published paper. Let's talk about the - well, 4 let's talk about the various columns. I'd like to cover 5 this with you in some detail. 6 First of all, and just as background, could 7 you please describe what your major functions were in 8 both designing and carrying out these studies that 9 resulted in the data that's set forth in Table 2 on 10 exhibit 249 and 250? 11 A I was responsible for coming up with the list of things 12 we would measure, so I made the assessment as to what to 13 measure, what I reasonably felt we could measure, and my 14 laboratory did the actual measurements. 15 Q So those would be your two principle functions with respect to this work? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And that would probably apply to the second studies where 19 messenger RNA assays were used? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Generally speaking, do you think these measurements were done in an appropriate and accurate manner? 23 A I think so. 24 Q From your discussion with Mr. Thornton this morning (sic), I take it you had no responsibility for the statistical analysis that resulted in Table 2, is that correct? 28 A No. You are correct. 	 carried out some of the assays. I do not know about the cortisol assay. That was not one that I was responsible for. I believe Dr. Wiltbank had done that. But most of them would have been done by full-time technicians of working under my supervision. Q For example, were the assays involving the cytokines, c-y-t-o-k-i-n-e-s, with interleukin 1 and interleukin 2, those would have been done by full-time technicians, is that correct? A That's correct. Q That was the machinery or the equipment and the apparatus and whatever else was needed to do those assays, is that something that all had been in the lab for some time? A We had had access to. Some of the equipment is very expensive and so shared by several labs, so some of it may have been physically located somewhere else. These things they would have used before. Q Okay. That was my next question. Thank you. By "they" you meant the technicians? A The technicians, yes. Q Thank you. The units for each of the various variables are indicated in parentheses, and it looks like you made, you or the statistician, made a logarithmic transfer on each of the numbers, is that correct, or transformation - A That's what the other one would refer to, ye. A That's a logarithm, yes.

1	Blends, et al.	Page 47
	Page 45	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	 of that number is the number that's actually used to analyze, correct? A That's my understanding of what was done, yes. Q All right. Was that done, the use of the natural logarithm done at your direction? A I do not recall how that procedure was arrived at. I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, that Steve, the individual who was doing that work, was concerned about the statistical problem called heterostevasticity (ph). THE REPORTER: Called what? A A-1 Let me use a different word. The heterogeneous, h-e-t-e-r-o-g-e-n-e-o-u-s. Unequal. Let's use this word. Unequal variances. V-a-r-i-a-n-c-e-s. Q And making a natural log transformation, is a standard, unique in those circumstances? A Is one of several commonly used techniques. I believe Steve MR. THORNTON: Try not to interrupt. A Sorry. Q Why don't we do that one more time, just for the record, doctor, to make sure John got it correctly. Is it true that making a natural logarithmic transformation in the circumstances you described is standard statistical technique? A That's true. 	 Q In fact, I think everything here was - that would apply to, is that true? A Not quite. Many things it does. Q Okay. The third main response variable, chemiliminescense, PMA. First of all, what does PMA mean? A Phorbol miristate acetate. I know I'm going to have to spell this. P-h-o-r-b-o-l, m-i-r-i-s-t-a-t-e, I believe. Acetate, a-c-e-t-a-t-e. Q And then the number apparently has the acronym, RLU, is that correct? A That's correct. That stands for relative luminescence, l-u-m-i-n-e-s-c-e-n-c-e, units. Q Describe the assay in some detail, if you would, including what relative luminescence units means. A Yes. Here we take lymphocytes from the blood, and we add to them a stimulant. There's several that we could have used. Phorbol miristate acetate, or PMA, is the one that we used here. This stimulates certain cells, mostly from blood, a cell type called a neutrophil, which is a component in the immune system that engulfs some digest type bacteria. We also add a detector, I believe, luminol, l-u-m-i-n-o-l, was added. And the active neutrophils produced oxygen radicals, this is part of the pathway that they use to kill bacteria. This interacts with the luminol and gives off light, hence the name, chemiluminescence.
	Dogo 46	Page 48
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A I did not - I did not go through the data in extreme detail to check that, but it seemed reasonable. Q With respect to the first two main response variables, concanavalin A and phytochemagglutanin, the units appear to be DPM, is that correct? A That is correct. Q What does that mean? A Disintegrations per minute. These - should I explain the assays? 	 detector. And the relative luminescence units is simply how many protons of light we detected for the output of the instrument. It's called relative luminescence units because it really has no specific number, like disintegrations per minute does with radioactivity. It's used in association with it. Q So, every unit would be a whole bunch of protons, is that correct? A Probably. I don't know the details of that. Q All right. Is there a particular reason or reasons that you chose these three at the top of Table 2 as the main response variables? And please describe that system. A I don't recall that discussion at all about how that was going to be presented in the table. Q Well, picking out these various variables was your primary responsibility, is that correct? A Picking out the whole list was my primary responsibility. But I don't recall discussing calling any of them primary and secondary. I don't know why that distinction is made there. Q Well, who was the lead author of the Part 3 table, if it wasn't
29 30 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A That's true. Q And in your opinion, was it appropriate? Page 46 A I did not - I did not go through the data in extreme detail to check that, but it seemed reasonable. Q With respect to the first two main response variables, concanavalin A and phytochemagglutanin, the units appear to be DPM, is that correct? A That is correct. Q What does that mean? A Disintegrations per minute. These - should I explain the assays? Q Please. A These assays are based on taking lymphocytes from blood, culture them in the presence of a stimulant, and measuring their DNA symphysis. The DNA symphysis is measured by adding a radioactive isotope of the phymidine p-h-y-m-i-d-i-n-e, and measuring how much of the phymidine is incorporated into the cells. And for this, we measured the amount of radioactivity in the cells that the units for that were disintegrations, how many radioactive phase per minute occurred. 	 The instrument that we use to details light is called a luminometer, it's effectively detector. And the relative luminescence units is how many protons of light we detected for the o the instrument. It's called relative luminescence because it really has no specific number, lidisintegrations per minute does with radioactive used in association with it. Q So, every unit would be a whole bunch of proton correct? A Probably. I don't know the details of that. Q All right. Is there a particular reason or reasor you chose these three at the top of Table 2 as the response variables? And please describe that I don't recall that discussion at all about how the going to be presented in the table. Q Well, picking out these various variables w primary responsibility, is that correct? A Picking out the whole list was my primary response But I don't recall discussing calling any of them and secondary. I don't know why that distinction there. Q Well, who was the lead author of the Part 3 tall

Sta	LЪ	lends, et al.	March 14, 2014			
		Page 49			Page 51	
	0					
1	Q	Going then down the list, the next variable, the next	1		We then have IL1 of first in serum and then	
2		response variable, which is the lead one, top one, under	2		in vitro, with the units being picograms per milliliter,	
3		secondary response variables, is S. aureus, or	3		correct?	
4		staphylacoccus aureas, is that correct?	4		Correct.	
5	А	That's correct.	5	Q	And hypo - that prefix indicates 10 to the minus 12, is	
6	Q	But again, if they were measuring DPM, which would be the	6		that right?	
7		same procedures as before, is that correct?	7	Α	Correct.	
8	А		8	Q	So, we're a couple order - well, as compared to a	
9		MR. THORNTON: Mr. Lawrence, you should	9	_	milligram per milliliter, we're a couple orders of	
10		probably make clear that you're dealing with the table on	10		magnitude down, is that correct?	
11		249, excuse me, 250 or 249, you started talking about		А		
12		both and now a different one.		Q		
	\mathbf{O}	You're absolutely correct. We are looking at the table			Yes.	
14	X	on 250 at the moment, correct?			All right.	
	Δ	That is the one I'm looking at.			There is considerably more IgG than there is interleukin	
			16		1.	
	Q	Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Thornton.				
17		Going down the list in 250, the next			And what is interleukin 1?	
18		response variable is pokeweed. You may have explained			Interleukin 1 is - interleukin means between leukocytes.	
19		this to Mr. Thornton a bit. Can you tell us what that's	19		So, it is the factor, protein factor, produced by certain	
20		all about, briefly?	20		leukocytes in the body that regulate other leukocytes.	
	A	That is an agent causing in pokeweed that stimulates		_	Would the chemical messenger be another way of expressing	
22	-	certain lymphocytes to proliferate.	22		it?	
23	Q	So again, lymphocyte proliferation that's being			That would be another way of expressing it, yes.	
24		determined here?	24	Q	And what is the significance of serum interleukin 1	
25	А	That is correct.	25		levels to the status of immune function in a cow at a	
26	Q	And that would be true of the staph. aureas?	26		particular time?	
		That's correct.	27	Α	Elevated interleukin 1 levels is often associated with	
28	Q	And then the next one is IgG in the serum, correct?	28		inflammatory processes and disease processes.	
29	-	That's correct.	29	Q	Are there things other than inflammation that cause	
30	0	And the units are milligrams per milliliter, correct?	30		elevated interleukin 1?	
	•					
		Dogo 50			Dogo 52	
		Page 50			Page 52	
1	A		1	A	Ŭ	
	\sim	That is correct, yes.	1		Page 52 Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain.	
2	A Q	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the	2		Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain.	
2 3	Q	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct?	2 3	Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going	
2 3 4	Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct.	2 3 4	Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1	
2 3 4 5	Q A Q	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round?	2 3 4 5	Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood?	
2 3 4 5 6	Q A Q	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct.	2 3 4 5 6	Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts.	
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams.	2 3 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q A A Q	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A A Q	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A A Q	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A A Q	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A A Q	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q A A Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q A Q A Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A A Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A A Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and measure the IgG in serum of that cow at that time. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily directed just at animals, but at humans, that you rely on	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A A Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and measure the IgG in serum of that cow at that time. The in vitro, we collected cells, placed them in culture and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily directed just at animals, but at humans, that you rely on in your - that you have relied on in your immunological	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A A Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and measure the IgG in serum of that cow at that time. The in vitro, we collected cells, placed them in culture and measured their ability to produce IgG in culture.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily directed just at animals, but at humans, that you rely on in your - that you have relied on in your immunological studies in the past?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A A Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and measure the IgG in serum of that cow at that time. The in vitro, we collected cells, placed them in culture and measured their ability to produce IgG in culture.	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily directed just at animals, but at humans, that you rely on in your - that you have relied on in your immunological studies in the past?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and measure the IgG in serum of that cow at that time. The in vitro, we collected cells, placed them in culture and measured their ability to produce IgG in culture. Then the next variable is IgA in serum, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily directed just at animals, but at humans, that you rely on in your - that you have relied on in your immunological studies in the past? There are. I would have to go back to my records and look them up to give you an exact reference, but there	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q A Q A A Q A Q A Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and measure the IgG in serum of that cow at that time. The in vitro, we collected cells, placed them in culture and measured their ability to produce IgG in culture. Then the next variable is IgA in serum, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 0 0 11 122 133 14 155 166 177 188 199 200 21 222 233 24	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily directed just at animals, but at humans, that you rely on in your - that you have relied on in your immunological studies in the past? There are. I would have to go back to my records and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q A Q A A Q A Q A Q A Q A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and measure the IgG in serum of that cow at that time. The in vitro, we collected cells, placed them in culture and measured their ability to produce IgG in culture. Then the next variable is IgA in serum, correct? Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 122 133 14 155 166 177 188 199 200 211 222 23 24 25	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily directed just at animals, but at humans, that you rely on in your - that you have relied on in your immunological studies in the past? There are. I would have to go back to my records and look them up to give you an exact reference, but there	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q AQA A QAQ A QAQ	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and measure the IgG in serum of that cow at that time. The in vitro, we collected cells, placed them in culture and measured their ability to produce IgG in culture. Then the next variable is IgA in serum, correct? Correct. And the reported units are the same again, milligrams per milliliter, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily directed just at animals, but at humans, that you rely on in your - that you have relied on in your immunological studies in the past? There are. I would have to go back to my records and look them up to give you an exact reference, but there are such references available.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Q AQA A QAQ A QAQ A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and measure the IgG in serum of that cow at that time. The in vitro, we collected cells, placed them in culture and measured their ability to produce IgG in culture. Then the next variable is IgA in serum, correct? Correct. And the reported units are the same again, milligrams per milliliter, correct? Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily directed just at animals, but at humans, that you rely on in your - that you have relied on in your immunological studies in the past? There are. I would have to go back to my records and look them up to give you an exact reference, but there are such references available. Have you ever done work in the nature of, for example, of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Q AQA A QAQ A QAQ A	That is correct, yes. And again, the logarithmic transformation made on the absolute number, correct? Correct. And then the statistics are round? Correct. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, if you could I'm sorry, I'm just - I'm just wondering that if it should be micrograms per milliliter rather than milligrams. MR. THORNTON: Doctor, take your hand down. If you would. Excuse me. MR. THORNTON: It was okay when you were looking at me, because the court reporter is between us. But now you're facing the other way. Okay. With that understanding, we will continue. What's the difference between IgG in the serum and the next variable IgG in vitro? In serum, we collect the blood sample from the cow and measure the IgG in serum of that cow at that time. The in vitro, we collected cells, placed them in culture and measured their ability to produce IgG in culture. Then the next variable is IgA in serum, correct? Correct. And the reported units are the same again, milligrams per milliliter, correct? Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Possibly. I am not familiar enough with the work on that to know for certain. All right. If there are no inflammatory processes going on in a cow, would you expect to find any interleukin 1 in the blood? You would expect to find small amounts. Is there a particular reference that you would - that refers to a discussion of these various subjects related to interleukin 1? Not off the top of my head, but they do exist. Well, for example, there's a standard text, perhaps even a couple of them on veterinary immunology, one of them is by Tizard, T-i-z-a-r-d, is that correct? I am not familiar with that particular work, but it could be. There are standard texts available. That could be one of them. Okay. You can't think of the name of one as you sit here? Not off the top of my head. Are there any standard immunology texts, not necessarily directed just at animals, but at humans, that you rely on in your - that you have relied on in your immunological studies in the past? There are. I would have to go back to my records and look them up to give you an exact reference, but there are such references available. Have you ever done work in the nature of, for example, of doing vaccine trials for drug companies and that sort of	

	lends, et al.		March 14, 2014
	Page 53		Page 55
2 3 4 4 0 5 A 6 Q 7 8 A 9 10 11 12 13 14 Q 15 16 17 A 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Would that type of work typically be done by veterinary immunologists? I would think so. That's not something you have ever been involved in? I have not. All right. Why did you look at both interleukin 1 in serum and in vitro in this particular study? The interleukin 1 in serum gives us a base line of where the animals are at. In vitro, as I recall how these studies were done, we're measuring a stimulation, so we're measuring the ability of the lymphocytes in the blood to elevate interleukin 1 in response to a challenge. And the challenge in this case was, hopefully, the electric shock that was going on at levels or something else? No, no. The challenge in this was - I hope I am remembering this correctly. Method section for this. The challenges that were used for this was propylene nitrogen. What was done was, the cows were treated either as control or voltage. We took the lymphocytes from the blood of both control and treated cows, and we stimulated them with propylene nitrogen. This will elevate their production of the interleukin. And we measured how much elevation we saw. So we're going from very, very little, essentially none, if I recall correctly, without the stimulation, to detectable levels. So we're measureing whether the voltage changed, whether or not they could produce interleukin 1 and 2 in response to the propylene nitrogen.	4 5 A 6 Q 7 8 9 A 10 Q 11 A 12 Q 13 A 14 A 15 16 Q 17 18 19 20 A 22 23 24 25 26 Q 27 28	 And E to the zero power is 1, indicating no change, correct? Correct. And the number we have associated with the interleukin 1 mean change controls is very close to - not equal to zero, but very close, correct? That's what it looks to me like, yes. Then the mean change of treatments is 0.450, correct? That's what this shows, yes. Okay. If you wanted to get the absolute number, you would raise the number E to that power, correct? That would give you the actual levels, or it would give you the geometric means of that number, yes.
	I IJ BOOK		
	Page 54		Page 56
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 A 12 Q 13 14 15 A 16 Q 17 18 A 19 Q 20 21 23 A 24 Q 25 A 25 A 26 27 28 Q 29	Okay. Is that described in the text of the paper somewhere? It is described in MR. THORNTON: 249. 249. I don't know if all of it is described in detail in this one or not, but it is described. We can look at 250. Well, let's do the math here a little bit as to the interleukin 1 in serum. The next column over has two numbers, one on top and one below, correct? That's correct. And those numbers represent the mean change of controls on top and the mean change of treatment on the bottom, correct? That's what it looks like, yes. And the treatments would be those cows getting the shock from what's described in the paper, exhibit 250, correct? That's correct. So, if we are looking at the concentration in picrograms per milliliter of the controls, the mean change when exposed to the pokeweed was - the natural logarithm of that number is minus 0.085, correct? That's correct. Yes. And that indicates a very small change, correct? I don't have a variance associated with that, so I can't really say that. But it looks to me to be a small change. All right. Well, if we're looking at the absolute value of the change, we'd have to invert the natural logarithm, in other words, raise E - the number E to that power to	3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 0 11 4 12 0 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 A	 That's how I interpret what was done here. Okay. Very good. Let me then show you exhibit - I think I handed you exhibit 253, which I will represent to you is that same Part III paper, but it was printed off the electronic data that was produced by the University in response to subpoena back in late 2007, from the data that was compiled that were labeled as yours, as the copy service hired by the University indicated, and it appears there's a whole bunch of data attached to that copy of the Part III paper. Okay. Are the documents attached, do they look familiar to you? They don't really look familiar, but that's because I haven't looked at this in a very long time. MR. THORNTON: You're talking about, Mr. Lawrence, Appendix 3? Yes. I'm talking about - well, actually Appendix - yeah, it would start with - MR. THORNTON: Sheffield 304.

Page 57 Page 59 MR. THORNTON: Thank you. have studied, but some. 1 1 0 O And on through the end of that document. 2 You indicated about a hundred total, but not all 2 Assuming that data came from the disk 3 associated with immune function? 3 4 produced by the University in response to subpoena back 4 А Right. 5 in late 2007, do you have any argument with the 5 Q Then we get, in the third column on Table 2, exhibit 250, 6 conclusion of, that that's data from this study, Part 6 the column with the mean difference or treatment minus control, is that correct? 7 III? 7 8 A I see no reason, from what I'm seeing here, to say it 8 That's what it says. Α 9 otherwise. 9 0 And the arithmetic there is simply to subtract one number **10** Q Okay. Then back to Table II on page 9 of 250, you have a 10 from the other that's contained in the column to the 11 pair of variables for IL 2, or interleukin 2 in serum, 11 left, is that correct? 12 and then the following one in vitro, correct? 12 A That's what it appears to have been done, yes. 13 That's correct. 13 0 And in that column, under IgG serum, we see the number Α 14 **Q** By the way, where did you draw the cells from the cows to 14 0.017, correct? 15 do the in vitro measurements? What part of the cow did 15 А That's shown here, yes. And you spoke to Mr. Thornton about that earlier this 16 it come from? 16 Q A They came from the - I believe they came from the tail, afternoon, correct? 17 17 that's where we usually collect blood samples from. 18 A I recall discussing IgGs. I don't recall if I recall 18 19 Q But the cells would come from there also? 19 talking about that specific number, but, yes. 20 А Yes. Q And I think you indicated that the comparable number in 20 21 Q All right. And why did you choose to study interleukin exhibit 249 was 0.015, is that correct? 21 22 29 22 A What I said there was based on a misunderstanding that I **23** A Interleukin 2 is a - one of the interleukins that is had at the time. I recall this discussion now. I was 23 24 comparing apples to oranges there. often changed in response to inflammation and infection. 24 25 25 Q Okay. It's also, at the time we did this, if I recall 26 26 A Let me go back and correct. correctly, interleukins were not very easy to study in 27 Q Please. That's what I was getting to. 27 cattle, as opposed to humans, of immunological assays. 28 To measure them very easily wasn't available, so we were 28 A Let's go back, because I was getting a little confused 29 having to rely on rather tedious bio-assays for doing 29 here. In exhibit 250, the number here is a difference in means, it's not a P factor. Table 2 in exhibit 249 is 30 these. So we did not have the ability to measure a lot 30 Page 58 Page 60 of different things. These were two that we felt we just the P value. So they're completely unrelated -1 1 2 could measure. 2 well, they're not completely unrelated, but they are not 3 Q Well, were the assays and the measurement techniques 3 comparable numbers. You would not expect them to be the 4 utilized in this study any different than would be done 4 same. I apologize, I - I was looking at the two tables 5 on human blood or human cells to determine interleukin 1 5 and I was thinking this was a P value and it's not. or interleukin 2 levels? 6 Can I take a look at 249, because I don't have a copy of 6 0 that one. I'll get a copy of that one after today's 7 They were assays that could be done on human blood, and 7 Α in the past were done on human blood. But today they 8 8 deposition. 9 have been supplanted by other methods. 9 I have an extra copy for you. Α Q Was that true back in '99 or 2000 when this work was If you could. I appreciate that. While she is copying 10 10 Q 249, let's talk a little bit more about 250. 11 done? 11 I don't recall for certain, but I believe that the In 250, the P-value is, as calculated by 12 Α 12 immunological assays would have been available at that Mr. LeMire on behalf of the researchers, is in the far 13 13 14 time for humans, but not for cattle. 14 right column directly across from the label IgA serum, 15 Q And then, the last response variable is cortisol, 15 correct? That seems to be correct, yes. 16 correct? 16 Α That's correct. 17 0 And that P value is 0.796 as reflected in Table 2, 17 Α 0 And what is cortisol? 18 exhibit 250, correct? 18 19 Cortisol is a glucocorticoid produced by the adrenal 19 А Oh, yes, IgA. IgA, yes. Α gland. It's often seen elevated in stress situations. 20 20 0 So, the response of IgA was nowhere even near statistical Q 21 Will all of these variables necessarily show change for 21 significance, correct? 22 any challenge of any type to the immune system? 22 А That's based on this test. That's what that would say to 23 Α Not necessarily. 23 you. 24 0 Are there many, many other response variables associated 24 Q Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. However, the statistic done in exhibit 250 is more 25 with immune function of cattle that could be studied as 25 А part of - of studies such as this? 26 26 extensive than what's done here and it did show the 27 А Yes. 27 difference. 28 O And I take it you've studied quite a few more and did the Exhibit 250 is the one in front of you - -28 0 follow-up study later, is that correct? А 29 29 Oh, okay. I'm getting my exhibits mixed up. 30 Α We studied some more. Fewer than I would have liked to 30 MR. THORNTON: When you say here, --

Sta	ar B	Blends, et al.	March 14, 2014		
		Page 61		-	Page 63
20 21 22 23 24 25	Q A Q A Q	exhibit 250 is the one that the researchers collectively decided to include in the published paper again, is that correct? That is what was in the - this part. I do not recall the time course of when the various ways of analyzing this was done. This may have been done before the statistics of the other paper were done. Probably was. But I don't know that for certain. Well, exhibit 250, which is, the front sheet entitled, "Dairy Cow Response to Electrical Environment, Final Report, Part III, Immune Function Response to Low-Level Electrical Current Exposure, submitted to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission. That was the final paper that came out of that initial study, correct? That was the final submission to the Minnesota Public Utilities, that's correct. By the way, did you have anything to do with the activities leading up to the University or Professor Reinemann's obtaining the contract, if you will, from the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission of terms - the request for proposal or anything like that? No, I was not involved in any of that work. My involve- ment came after the involvement with that.	4 5 6 7 8	Q A A A A A I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	these were prepared in. It may be that 249 was prepared subsequent to 250. I don't know. Okay. And in 249, page 22, under - well, the columns to the right have a P value over the top of both of them it appears, is that correct? That's correct. So, what do those numbers mean? Can you tell us starting with the chemiluminescence as an example, the top one? Yes. An alternative way of looking at the statistics here, that I would, with my non-professional understand- ing of statistics, say, is better than what was done in this table. But that is perhaps debatable. MR. THORNTON: This table you pointed to was exhibit 250? This table is 250. So, in the table in 249, there were two things that were going on here. If you look at the figures that follow, you will see that there are two lines shown here, say on page 24 for chemiluminescence. One line, which has solid filled in circles, is the control group, the other line that has an open circle is the group exposed to current. So, there are two things that you can look at. You can look at whether this had changed over time and whether there's a treatment difference. So the treatment, in effect, is averaging all of these together and say, is the overall effect of treatment different? The other thing is, an important question is, perhaps the overall effect isn't different, but you've got two lines that are not parallel, the two lines - the control group isn't changing and the treatment
		Page 62			Page 64
2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 8 6 6 7 7 8 8 9 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 14 14 15 16 17 12 20 21 22 23 24 25 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	MR. THORNTON: When you say initial proposal, are you talking about the entire Minnesota Science Advisors' study or are you talking about Part III? I'm talking about the entire one. And there were papers labeled Part 1 and Part 2 in this series also, correct? That's my understanding, yes. But they did not address items that were specifically aimed at assessing immunological function, is that a fair That's correct. Okay. Let's look at exhibit 249, the comparable table, if you will. I realize it's not exactly the same format. Page 22.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	A Q A Q t A Q t A Q A A Q A A Q A A Q A A Q A A Q A A Q A A Q A A Q A	group is going down. And that's what that treatment by time interaction, the third column, is measuring. And for chemiluminescence, for example, we see a P value of .679, suggesting that there's no difference in the average chemiluminescence. But the treatment by time is whether those two lines are parallel to each other or converging with coming together. That's what that column will represent. Would these P value calculations also be done following a natural logarithmic transformation? I believe that is correct. Of the two columns on page 22 of exhibit 249, does the treatment column, those numbers, should they correspond to any of the columns in exhibit 250? Not directly, no. Why not? The methodology was different in how they were assessed. This (indicating) was done using the technique known as analysis of co-variance. MR. THORNTON: You've got to say which number you're talking about when you say "this." 249 was done using a technique called analysis of co-variance. And 250 was not? 250 was done using a t-test, which is not directly comparable. All right. Let's go back to 250 for a moment, Table 2. The paper itself describes three different groups of 8 cows of 4 treatments and 4 controls for each group, correct?

Paul Halders Star Blends,		me 1	Lewis G. Sheffield, Ph.D. March 14, 2014
Star Dienus,	Page 65		Page 67
2 Q And t 3 is that 4 A That 5 Q In you 6 what 7 collet 8 A Giver 9 the tin 10 proba 11 Q Why 12 A It tak 13 methot 14 Q Okay 15 profet 16 with 17 A I hav 18 profet 19 Q All r 20 attem 21 expet 22 A Tm r 23 Q All r 24 A Solet 25 Q Fine. 26 cross 27 A The t 28 are refet	es into account the trends over time, which the d in 250 I don't believe does as complete the job. Fair enough. And again, you don't claim to be a sional statistician, but you've had much contact the subject? e had contact with the subject. It is not my ssion. ight. Is there a concept in statistics that ots to analyze multiple replications of the same iment on different subjects? ot quite sure what the question is. ight. Is there such a thing in statistics as a two-way analysis? erminology that you're using there, that I think you ferring to, is a crossover design, where - you be referring to a couple of different things.	4 (5 6 7 8 (9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 (18 19 20	Sheffield, that that data came out of the materials again that were provided by the University of Wisconsin subpoena seven years ago, and they were among your materials, I've got a photocopy of the disk they came off of, if it will help. MR. THORNTON: I don't think that's correct. I think the last four lines were calculated by somebody else.
	Page 66		Page 68
2repea3design4that.5that w6not, b788referring9later10aroun11Q12A13block14separa15fairly16Q17the san18per bl1912 cov20at the21A23simila24it was25time26Q27A28Q29for the	ype of design, where you have the same experiment ted three separate times, is called a blocked , and there are statistical methods of dealing with I do not recall, it may be mentioned in here, if as accounted for in the analysis that was done or out there are statistical ways of doing that. The other thing that I wondered if you were ing to was taking one cow as a treatment, but then making their control and switching the group id. son't referring to that. were not. Okay. So, yes, I do not know if the ing effect, the fact that it was done on three tte times was accounted for or not, but there are standard ways of dealing with effect. would generally not do the statistical mathematics ne with a blocked design as you described, 8 cows bock for treatment or control, as you would in all vs control and 12 cows treatment had the work done same time, is that a fair statement? econd situation that you mentioned is a little bit er analysis. The analysis was actually very t, but you would normally account for the fact that done on three separate occasions by including a called block in the statistical model. details of that would be more appropriate would be done by a statistician, yes. u know whether, in exhibit 250, Table 2, the P value a detailed independent test, was that done simply gating all of the data together and treating it as	23 24 A 25 26 Q 27 28 29 A	 and I'll stick to the block, for the moment, maybe forever. MR. THORNTON: You can get to whatever you want. I will. MR. THORNTON: I think there's an issue about who did the last four lines. You may be right. Regardless. Do you recall the second experiment where the messenger RNA techniques were used, which you described earlier, resulting in a set of data that looks like these top two blocks across the page - Yes. - for the variants? Yes. And this goes on and on for four pages of Right. And those would be almost a hundred variables that you talked about? I think there's actually a little more than a hundred, but in that vicinity. What is the - can you describe - well, let's talk about the interleukins in particular for a moment, find them here. I think they are on page 2.

Star Blends, et al.	March 14, 2014		
Page 69	Page 71		
 page 2, we have IL1a and IL1b, is that correct? A That's correct. Q I think those are usually referred to as interleukin 1 alpha and interleukin 1 beta, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And this set of experiments distinguish between the two sub types with interleukin 1, correct? A Correct. Q What's the difference between the two? Can you describe what it is and the significance biologically, briefly? A It's been a long time since I have looked into interleukins, but they are very similar. They are what we refer to, if I recall correctly, as molegus genes, that is, they originated as a gene duplication. So they are slightly different protein sequences. In terms of the biological activity, I believe they are very similar. That's why, in the bio-assay that we did, previously we could not detect the difference between - we were detecting total interleukin 1 and you can't detect the difference between alpha and beta forms. Q Then, for example, in the interleukin 1a or alpha column, as an example, what do the numbers mean? A These are best known as - how to explain this? Relative means, they are intensity of light multiplied by the area that that light covers. That's the best way of thinking it. They really don't have any standard mix of measures associated with it, like disintegrations per minute, or micrograms per milliliter. Q Does that intensity of the light correspond to something about interleukin 1 alpha or beta? 	 what these various variables are. I know we've got about a hundred of them, close to it. And maybe with respect to each one, if you can tell us why you chose to study it, if you can recall? (Discussion held off the record). Q Dr. Sheffield, I would like to take the variables on exhibit 254 and have you explain to us what each one is a little bit, and whether serum or vitro or something else, and a little bit about why you chose to study each one, if you can recall. I realize it's a long time ago, and there's a lot of variables here. You may not recall. I A I will do the best I can Q Thank you. A on this. First of all, some of these - many of these, our initial hope was to actually study far more than these. Technically, we were not able to do that. These were chosen, in part, because they are the ones that we had reliable ways of studying in cattle. That was an important thing, because the technology to do things in cattle often lagged behind what it is in medicine for many reasons. But, okay. Almost need a magnifying glass. Q I actually brought one along, believe it or not, somewhere. I'll get it for you. A ACK2 is a fairly general gene for acetate kinase. It has important roles in a lot of different cell metabolisms. So it's not something that would be restricted to the immune system. But adenylate cyclase is an enzyme. By 		
 Page 70 1 A Not directly. 2 Q How about indirectly? 3 A There are a number of factors that affect it. Obviously, 4 the amount of interleukin 1 alpha, for example, messenger 5 RNA affects it. So, within interleukin 1 alpha, you can 6 make comparisons. So, if you see a larger number, you 7 would interpret that as having more interleukin 1 alpha 8 messenger RNA. What you can't do is go across genes and 9 say that it means a bigger number for interleukin 1 alpha 10 than interleukin 2 means that there's more interleukin 1 11 alpha than interleukin 2. You can't make that 12 comparison. 13 Q So we can't get to, for example, picograms per 14 milliliters? 15 A No. 16 Q But you can compare the quantity of interleukin 1 alpha 17 to itself in two different times or two different groups 18 of cows, fair to say? 19 A Fair enough. 20 Q And were these numbers then the basis for the analysis of 21 changes in interleukin 1 alpha and interleukin 1 beta and 22 the various other paramaters here? 23 A Yes. 24 Q And they were the basis upon which the statistical 25 analysis was performed which are reflected in the draft 26 paper, draft abstract that counsel discussed with you 27 this morning (sic)? 28 A Yes. 29 Q I believe that was in 251. 30 I would like to then go through with you 	 the way, all of these are messenger RNA. MR. THORNTON: You're going to have to spell some of these, doctor. 4 A Let me finish my thought here. All of these are messenger RNAs. So the messenger RNA is a cell. I've tried to indicate whether the protein is something that is going to be in the cell or outside of the cell. But adenylate cyclase, a-d-e-n-y-l-a-t-e, c-y-c-l-a-s-e. 9 This is a cell protein that's very important in hormone C. It is found in many cells, probably most cells in the body, there may be some that don't have it. So you would find it in the immune system, but a lot of other places. It's one of these signal pathways that some hormones used to give their signals across the membrane into a cell. ATP synthase is a very general gene. It does exactly what the name suggests, it is responsible for producing ATP, so it's something all cells would have, and expressed at a fairly - maybe not completely constant level, but it's responsible for using ATP, which is the main energy source of cells. CFos, F-o-s, is what is called a transcription factor. This is a protein that binds to the DNA in the nucleus of the cell to promote messenger RNA production of certain genes. It's widely distributed, and it is often seen elevated during stress events in the cell. But there are quite a few things that will elevate CFos. Those same comments hold for the next column, CJun. J-u-n. CaATPase, the Ca refers to 		

Star I	Blends, et al.			March 14, 2014
	Page 73			Page 75
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 73 calcium. This is an enzyme that grades ATP and transports calcium across cell membranes. Cells often use calcium as a message. Normally, calcium in the cytosol cell is very, very low. And the calcium ATPase is involved in pumping calcium out of the cell to keep its concentration in the cytosol very low. The next column stands for casein, c-a-s-e-i-n, kinase, k-i-n-a-s-e. There are two of those, and the same comments will apply to both of these columns. At first glance, this is a bit of a misnomer. Casein kinase you might think of as the enzyme that transfers phosphate to casein in the mammary gland. And we do call that that enzyme casein kinase, but this is a different casein kinase. It's an old terminology. Kinase, by the way, is an enzyme that transfers a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	-	and B2, which is different forms of this. Earlier I mentioned adenylate cyclase. This produces a compound called cyclic A&P. Cyclic A&P is what's called a second messenger. One of its effects is to activate a series of enzymes culminating in various responses. One of those responses is to increase the expression of certain genes. Those genes are those that have what's called a cyclically impede response element in the DNA sequence. The CREB is something that, it is a protein that actually binds to the DNA to promote expression of those genes. I hope that makes sense.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	phosphate from ATP to a protein or to something. Doesn't have to be a protein, but in this case it is a protein. Many years ago, these were named sometimes based on what they transferred phosphate to. This one, it was found that casein would receive the phosphate very easily, so it was called that, even though physiologically, it does far more than that. These are often involved in hormone signaling mechanisms inside the cell. The next are a series of proteins. CD 14, 23, 8, 3. These are cell surface antigens found in different types of lymphocytes. They are involved in self cell recognition and interactions of the cell with their environment. These are frequently found in	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Q A Q A	extremely important in nonspecific types of immunity and in antioxidant responses. During metabolism, the body produces large numbers of oxygen radicals. These are very damaging, and we have a whole series of enzymes that detoxify these oxygen radicals, using one of the enzymes involved in this. The next one, I do not recall exactly what that is. Fair enough. Looks like the initials are F-A-S, I think. No, there's another one before that.
	Page 74			Page 76
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 20 21 23 24 25 26 27 28 9 30	But maybe, yes. MR. THORNTON: You got a duce.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Q A Q A Q A Q Q Q	I'm not entirely sure which that refers to. Okay. Fair enough. The last two on the page? Glutathione, g-l-u-t-a-t-h-i-o-m-e, peroxidase, p-e-r-o-x-i-d-a-s-e. This is another of the enzymes involved in oxygen radical metabolism. The final column stands for glucose transport IV. Glucose does not cross cell membranes very well. So, we have to have specific cell membrane proteins to carry it across. This is one of the more common of the glucose transporters that would be present in cells. Let's stay on Page 1 for just a moment, Dr. Sheffield, because it is approaching 3:30. Let me ask you a couple more questions about this data, and we'll be done because of Mr. Thornton's schedule being concluded for today. MR. THORNTON: Sorry about that.

Stu			1	1111 ch 1 1, 2011
		Page 77		Page 79
1	-	-		
1	Q	And my understanding is, the top block of 10 represents	1	READING AND SIGNING CERTIFICATE
2		the control, the 10 control animals in this study, and	2	
				LIEWIS C. SHEEFIELD DhD do haraby contify
3		the second group represents the treatment animals?	3	I, LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, do hereby certify
4		That's what it looks to me like, yes.	4	that I have read the foregoing transcript of my
5	Q	And the application of the electricity to the treatment	5	deposition, recorded by John T. Kirby, of 3-14-14, and
6	•	animals is as described in your draft abstract, correct?	6	believe the same to be true and correct, (or except as
	۸			
7		That's correct.	7	follows, noting the page and line number of the change or
8	Q	And that would hold - that characterization of the data	8	addition and the reason why):
9		would hold true throughout all four?	9	WRITING IN TRANSCRIPT WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED
10	Α	As far as I know, it would, yes.	10	
11	Q	And in this case, this study was not done in separate	11	
12		blocks, but all 10 and 10 were studied at the same time?	12	
13	Α	That is correct.	13	
14	~		14	
	-			
15		animals, if you will, throughout?	15	
16		Correct.	16	
17	0	And in those circumstances, a simple two tail t-test	17	
18		would be one appropriate	18	
19		That would be a reasonable thing to do.	19	
20	Q	It would be a reasonable statistical methodology, you	20	
21		wouldn't have to worry about the blocking effect, is that	21	
22		correct?	22	
	Α		23	
24		it.	24	
25	Q	Fair enough. Unfortunately, why don't we go off the	25	
26	_	record. Let's go off the record for a moment.	26	
27			27	
28		(Discussion held off the record - 3:28 to 3:30).	28	DATE SIGNATURE
29			29	
30		MR. LAWRENCE: Doctor, while we were off	30	
		Page 78		Page 80
		Page 78		Page 80
-		Ŭ	1	STATE OF MINNESOTA)
1		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your		STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS.
1 2		Ŭ	2	STATE OF MINNESOTA)
		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your	2 3	STATE OF MINNESOTA) COUNTY OF DAKOTA } SS.
2		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m.	2 3 4	STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS.
2 3 4		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure.	2 3	STATE OF MINNESOTA) COUNTY OF DAKOTA } SS.
2 3 4 5		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned	2 3 4 5	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of
2 3 4		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you,	2 3 4 5 6	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin;
2 3 4 5		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned	2 3 4 5 6 7	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public
2 3 4 5 6 7		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena.	2 3 4 5 6 7	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA } ss. COUNTY OF DAKOTA } ss. Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA } ss. COUNTY OF DAKOTA } ss. Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability;</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA } ss. COUNTY OF DAKOTA } ss. Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability;</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA } Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA } ss. STATE OF MINNESOTA } ss. De it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter;</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS. COUNTY OF DAKOTA) SS. De it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been executed as evidenced by the preceding page.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA COUNTY OF DAKOTA } Be it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS. COUNTY OF DAKOTA) SS. De it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been executed as evidenced by the preceding page.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS. COUNTY OF DAKOTA) SS. De it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been executed as evidenced by the preceding page.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS. COUNTY OF DAKOTA) SS. De it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been executed as evidenced by the preceding page.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 7 8 9 0 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS. COUNTY OF DAKOTA) SS. De it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been executed as evidenced by the preceding page.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA) ss. COUNTY OF DAKOTA) ss. De it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been executed as evidenced by the preceding page.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 7 8 9 0 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA) ss. COUNTY OF DAKOTA) ss. De it known that I took the deposition of LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, Volume I, on the 14th day of March, 2014, at Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been executed as evidenced by the preceding page.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 16 7 18 9 20 12 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS. STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS. State OF DAKOTA) STATE NOT THE STATE OF DAKOTA OF DAKOTA, WISCONSIN; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been executed as evidenced by the preceding page. WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL THIS 16TH DAY OF MARCH, 2014.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	А	the record, it was agreed that Friday is good for your schedule, and we've agreed to continue this May 9 at 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Sure. MR. LAWRENCE: And I know counsel mentioned a subpoena earlier by mail. Is that sufficient for you, if I write you, send somebody else to serve you with a subpoena. MR. THORNTON: I can give you one right now, if you like. I will be here May 9, 9:00 a.m. MR. THORNTON: Okay. MR. LAWRENCE: Very good. Thank you. (3:31 o'clock a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	<pre>STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS. STATE OF MINNESOTA) SS. State OF DAKOTA) STATE NOT THE STATE OF DAKOTA OF DAKOTA, WISCONSIN; That I was then and there a notary public in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause; That the testimony of said witness was recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best of my ability; That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter; That the reading and the signing has been executed as evidenced by the preceding page. WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL THIS 16TH DAY OF MARCH, 2014.</pre>

Star Blends, et al.		Ι	Γ	March 14, 2014
	across (7)	40:3;70:5	amount (3)	59:24
Α	60:14;68:16,30;70:8;	affiliated (1)	43:12;46:17;70:4	application (1)
	- 72:14;73:2;76:18	5:20	amounts (2)	77:5
A&P (3)	activate (1)	afternoon (1)	13:6;52:6	applied (1)
74:30;75:3,3	75:4	59:17	amps (1)	29:10
abilities (1)	active (3)	Ag (1)	33:4	apply (3)
29:29	37:12;46:19;47:24	5:21	analogy (1)	42:18;47:1;73:9
ability (8)	activities (3)	again (11)	35:3	applying (3)
6:17;20:13;37:23;	20:20,21;61:22	31:11;35:9;49:6,23;	analysis (16)	16:19;29:24;33:24
38:1,2;50:23;53:11;	activity (2)	50:2,26,30;61:6;65:14;	8:20;17:11,11;21:30;	appreciate (1)
57:30	6:4;69:16	67:9;74:27	27:2;42:26;44:30;	60:10
able (6)	actual (4)	against (1)	64:19,22;65:6,26;66:5,	approach (3)
16:16;18:16;35:1;	7:17;40:2;42:14;	31:20	22,22;70:20,25	35:9,15,17
37:29;71:18;74:24	55:14	agent (1)	analyze (2)	approached (3)
above (1)	actually (21)	49:21	45:2;65:20	32:9,12,16
3:17	12:16;14:25;15:14;	aggregating (1)	analyzed (2)	approaching (1)
absence (1)	17:17;20:13;22:11;	66:30	27:20,25	76:22
23:13	26:27;27:4;30:24;	ago (4)	analyzer (2)	appropriate (10)
absolute (4)	38:23;41:15;43:16,18,	21:15;67:11;71:12;	29:1,8	8:13;14:18,20;24:25;
44:29;50:3;54:28;	24;45:1;56:27;66:22;	73:19	analyzing (1)	42:22;45:30;65:6,10;
55:12	68:24;71:17,25;75:9	agree (2)	61:9	66:26;77:18
absolutely (2)	add (2)	22:13;24:10	Anatomy (1)	approval (1)
49:13;74:21	47:16,23	agreed (2)	41:5	33:7
abstract (8)	added (2)	78:1,2	animal (18)	Area (5)
17:26;20:28;28:19,	47:24;74:15	Agriculture (2)	4:16,18,19,20;8:11,	4:9;5:5,18;40:19;
24;30:17;40:6;70:26;	adding (1)	8:5,6	13;21:22;24:10;25:19,	69:24
77:6	46:14	agriculture's (1)	23,25;30:6,11;33:13;	areas (1)
abusing (1)	addition (1)	33:11	36:16;38:13,21;62:2	13:3
32:27	79:8	ahead (12)	animals (31)	argument (1)
AC (1)	address (1)	5:2,2;11:15;12:2;	8:12;11:25;14:22;	57:5
21:17	62:16	14:1;19:12;22:3;25:28;	16:16,22,29;21:14;	arithmetic (1)
academic (1)	adenolation (1)	30:10;31:4;60:24;62:7	30:8,14;31:15;32:26,	59:9
43:7	74:13	aimed (1)	27;33:1,22;35:29;38:9,	arose (1)
acceptable (3)	adenosine (1)	62:17	16,24;39:23,26,29;	5:23
14:30;15:2,3	74:7	airplane (1)	40:1,4,9;52:21;53:9;	around (2)
ACCEPTED (1)	A-d-e-n-o-s-i-n-e (1)	41:14	77:2,3,6,14,15	18:17;66:10
79:9	74:8	al (1)	animals' (1)	arrive (1)
access (1)	adenylate (3)	23:27	16:26	55:28
44:14	71:30;72:8;75:2	A-l (1)	animal's (1)	arrived (1)
accessible (1)	a-d-e-n-y-l-a-t-e (1)	45:12	37:30	45:6
20:12	72:8	allowed (1)	anonymously (1)	aspect (2)
accomplish (1)	Adjustment (2)	27:5	14:28	26:28;29:17
24:5	17:30;35:5	almost (2)	anti-bodies (1)	aspects (2)
account (2)	administered (3)	68:22;71:23	7:11	5:26;6:16
65:12;66:23	25:7,26;31:15	along (2)	antibody (3)	assay (4)
accounted (2)	administration (3)	9:18;71:25	12:17;20:22,23	20:13;27:11;44:2;
66:5,14	30:7;31:2;38:10	alpha (11)	antigens (4)	47:14
accounting (1)	adrenal (1)	69:4,20,21,30;70:4,5,	6:21,22;13:4;73:27	assays (22)
67:1	58:19	7,9,11,16,21	antioxidant (1)	19:30;20:1,1,3;
accuracy (2)	adverse (1)	alphabetical (1)	75:18	26:28;27:9,12;42:19;
15:5,8	30:6	68:29	apologize (3)	43:16,17,20,23,25;
accurate (3)	advisors (1)	alteration (1)	6:12;43:4;60:4	44:1,6,12;46:9,11;
6:23;32:30;42:22	21:27	23:17	apparatus (1)	57:27;58:3,7,13
acetate (4)	Advisors' (1)	alternative (1)	44:11	A-s-s-a-y-s (1)
47:7,9,18;71:27	62:10	63:9	apparently (1)	20:4
a-c-e-t-a-t-e (1)	Advisory (2)	although (4)	47:10	assess (3)
47:9	17:24;19:15	10:12;25:18;38:29;	appear (3)	20:11;33:8;37:20
acid-base (1)	affect (6)	43:30	27:21;38:4;46:4	assessed (2)
23:18	16:22;20:18,19;38:5,	always (9)	appears (3)	37:23;64:17
ACK2 (1)	6;70:3	12:1;14:28;20:26,27;	56:18;59:12;63:5	assessing (2)
71:27	affected (1)	26:1,4,5;35:23;46:28	Appendix (2)	61:2;62:17
acronym (1)	34:10	among (2)	56:26,27	assessment (1)
47:10	affects (2)	35:13;67:11	apples (1)	42:12
		1	Í.	1

Min-U-Script®

Metropolitan Court Reporters, Inc. (612) 333-7333

assign (1) 16:29 assignment (1) 33:6 assistant (2) 5:3:29:12 associate (3) 8:25:19:18,26 associated (17) 6:1:7:5:8:14.23: 12:27;13:7;19:27; 21:28;30:7;40:9,25; 51:27:54:25:55:6; 58:24;59:3;69:27 association (2) 8:24;48:6 assume (2) 48:26;67:25 assuming (3) 48:27;55:26;57:3 ATP (5) 72:16,18,20;73:1,17 ATPase (1) 73:4 attached (3) 31:14;56:19,22 attempt (1) 13:17 attempting (1) 22:1attempts (1) 65:20 attributable (2) 32:18.19 attributed (1) 31:1 aureas (6) 6:27;28:1,2,4;49:4, 26 aureus (1) 49:3 author (4) 14:29;22:1;23:21; 48:21 authors (3) 28:15,16,17 available (5) 29:7;52:15,26;57:28; 58:13 avenine (3) 74:14,16,26 a-v-e-n-i-n-e (1) 74:15 average (1) 64:5 averaging (1) 63:24 avoid (4) 25:20,21,24;31:18 awards (1) 21:8 aware (1) 8.17

B **B1**(1) 74:30 **B2**(1) 75:1 bachelor (1) 4:15 back (13) 9:24;11:5;14:28; 27:6;41:23;52:24; 56:16;57:4,10;58:10; 59:26,28;64:27 background (3) 4:14;8:30;42:6 bacteria (4) 6:24,27;47:22,26 balance (1) 23:18 barn (8) 17:3;21:12,12,13; 25:3.23.25:31:11 base (8) 37:5,6,17,18,25,27; 38:3:53:8 based (9) 11:20;27:16;35:11; 40:5;46:11;55:23; 59:22;60:22;73:20 baseline (1) 23:8 Basic (2) 25:14;41:1 basically (2) 28:25;30:23 basis (3) 9:1;70:20,24 become (1) 67:6 becomes (1) 35:2 began (1) 5:25 beginning (3) 33:26,30;62:4 behalf (1) 60:13 behavior (1) 62:2 behavioral (1) 22:14 behind (1) 71:22 below (3) 54:9:76:27,28 beneficial (1) 37:14 best (10) 5:30;12:10,11;17:19; 19:13;23:2,4;69:23,25; 71:14 beta (4)

69:4,20,30;70:21 better (3) 29:30;32:24;63:11 beyond (1) 15:14 big (5) 14:21;39:8,18,20,22 bigger (3) 36:24;39:23;70:9 biggest (1) 39:5 binds (4) 6:30;72:23;75:10; 76:6 bio-assay (1) 69:17 bio-assays (1) 57:29 biologic (1) 11:22 biological (7) 7:23;11:23,29;12:12; 13:16,18;69:16 biologically (2) 36:27;69:10 **Biologists (3)** 10:4;32:23;39:14 biology (5) 4:8;25:14,15;26:20; 41:1 bit (12) 5:10.16:24:30:26:1: 49:19:54:8:55:16; 60:11;66:21;71:10,11; 73:11 blastogenesis (2) 27:11:32:4 bleeded (1) 74:27 block (7) 66:18,25;67:2;68:6; 76:27,28:77:1 blocked (2) 66:2,17 blocking (3) 66:13;77:21,23 blocks (3) 68:1,16;77:12 **blood** (18) 6:2;12:18;26:11,18; 33:22,26,29;46:11; 47:16.20:50:20:52:5: 53:12,22;57:18;58:5,7, 8 board (1) 14:9 **body** (9) 12:23,26;13:3;20:18; 46:20,27;51:20;72:11; 75:18 **Bonferioni** (8) 17:29;18:1,2,3;35:4, 8.15.17

Volume 1

both (7) 22:24:42:8:49:12: 53:6,22;63:4;73:9 bottom (5) 24:22,23;26:6;33:1; 54:13 bovine (1) 18:11 break (1) 41:11 breast (2) 4:24,27 brief (3) 4:4.13:5:17 briefly (3) 43:6;49:20;69:10 broad (1) 61:30 brought (1) 71:25 **BST** (2) 25:7,9 bunch (3) 41:9;48:7;56:19 business (3) 21:7;32:22;43:4 С Ca (1) 72:30 CaATPase (1) 72:30 calcium (6) 73:1,2,3,3,4,5 calculated (4) 55:19,22;60:12; 67:15 calculation (1) 55:21 calculations (1) 64:9 call (2) 17:1;73:14 called (26) 4:19;6:14;7:12,13, 15;8:7;12:22;16:12,14; 17:11;38:27;39:4;45:9, 11;47:20,30;48:3; 64:22;66:2,25;72:22; 73:22;74:13;75:3,3,7 calling (1) 48:18 calls (1) 39:13 CALS(1) 8:4 CALSIACUC (1) 32:26 came (8) 11:11;57:3,17,17; 61:18,27;67:9,12 can (46)

Lewis G. Sheffield, Ph.D. March 14, 2014

4:13:5:17:6:8.13; 9:11.16.22:13:22: 15:15,26,26,29;16:1, 21:17:14.19:21:27: 25:1,15,20,24;32:19; 38:16;39:24;41:11,11; 43:25;49:19;54:7;60:6; 62:6;63:7,22,22;67:17; 68:8,26;69:9;70:5,16; 71:3,4,12,14;76:5;78:9 cance (1) 14:25 cancer (2) 4:24,27 Care (1) 8:11 carried (1) 44:1 carry (2) 7:9;76:18 carrying (1) 42:8 carryoffs (1) 74:9 case (4) 17:5;53:14;73:18; 77:11 casein (6) 73:7,12,13,14,15,21 **c-a-s-e-i-n** (1) 73:8 catch (1) 41:14 cattle (11) 5:27;21:1;23:14; 28:13;29:10;32:1; 57:27:58:14,25:71:20, 22 cause (1) 51:29 causing (1) 49:21 caveats (1) 31:9 cavities (1) 12:23 **CD**(1) 73:26 Cdk1 (1) 74:3 cell (23) 6:14.30:7:2.9:47:20: 71:28;72:5,7,7,9,15,24, 27;73:2,4,5,25,27,29, 29;75:14;76:16,17 cells (20) 6:4,5,14;7:7;18:24; 20:16;46:16,17;47:19; 50:22;57:14,19;58:5; 72:10,10,18,21;73:2; 74:5:76:20 ceptors (1) 7:1

Min-U-Script®

certain (20) 7:4:10:20.21:13:28: 15:13:20:6.7.20.21: 25:6.15:30:26:47:19: 49:22;51:19;52:2; 58:12;61:12;72:25; 75:6 certainly (6) 13:13;21:8;23:5; 24:21:25:16:29:29 certainty (9) 11:12,18,19,29; 13:16,18,23;37:30; 40:9 **CERTIFICATE (1)** 79:1 certify (1) 79:3 CFos (2) 72:22,28 challenge (7) 37:17,20,24;53:13, 14,17;58:22 challenges (1) 53:19 chance (18) 10:21,22,22;32:18, 19,20;34:16,18,23,25, 26,30;35:22,23,24; 39:15,17,18 chances (1) 35:1 change (25) 13:10.12.13.14.26: 14:25:30:9:34:24; 37:18;38:20;39:10,11; 40:17:54:12,13,20,24, 27,29;55:3,7,10,18; 58:21:79:7 changed (5) 34:21;40:15;53:28; 57:24:63:23 changes (5) 23:13;36:18,21,24; 70:21 changing (1) 63:30 characterization (1) 77:8 charge (2) 19:21,23 check (2) 31:22:46:2 checked (1) 31:23 chemical (1) 51:21 chemicals (2) 6:3,18 chemiliminescense (1) 47.5chemiluminescence (7) 27:10:32:3:47:28;

63:8,18:64:3,5 chemistry (1) 4:8 choice (1) 41:6 choose (1) 57:21 chose (4) 48:11;71:3,11;75:12 chosen (1) 71:19 circle (1) 63:20 circles (1) 63:19 circulated (1) 48:28 circulates (1) 12:18 circulating (2) 12:27;23:17 circulation (1) 12:21 circumstances (3) 45:16,27;77:17 cited (1) 23:26 CJun (1) 72:30 claim (1) 65:14 clarify (1) 65:24 clear (2) 49:10;62:4 cleavage (2) 74:7.8 Clemson (1) 4:16close (5) 12:13;35:10;55:7,8; 71:2 co-authors (1) 48:29 Coding (2) 7:8,18 coin (1) 34:29 collaboration (1) 5:26 collect (6) 26:18,27;27:6,7; 50:20:57:18 collected (10) 26:12,12,15,23;27:3; 28:14;33:23,23;50:22; 65:7 collection (1) 26:22 Collectively (2) 28:10:61:5 College (5) 4:9:8:5.6:33:11;

40:22 column (20) 10:29:11:9:27:30: 54:9:59:5.6.10.13: 60:14;64:2,7,13;69:21; 72:30;73:7;74:7;75:15; 76:5.8.15 columns (5) 42:4;63:3;64:12,14; 73:10 coming (2) 42:11:64:7 comment (2) 15:15:33:16 comments (3) 48:28;72:29;73:9 **Commission** (2) 61:17,24 committee (7) 8:10,11;32:28;33:3, 11,12,14 common (2) 15:1:76:19 commonly (1) 45:17 communicates (1) 14:29 community (1) 14:7companies (1) 52:28 Company (1) 3:30comparable (4) 59:20;60:3;62:20; 64:26 compare (2) 23:7:70:16 compared (5) 26:8;36:5,21;38:6; 51:8 comparing (1) 59:24 comparison (10) 16:16;22:28,29;23:8; 24:26;34:2,4,5;35:12; 70:12 comparisons (4) 26:19;35:8,25;70:6 compilation (2) 19:8,9 compiled (1) 56:17 complete (1) 65:13 completed (1) 23:8 completely (4) 24:26;60:1,2;72:19 complicated (1) 39:17 component (1) 47:21

Volume 1

composition (1) 48:23 compound (2) 6:30:75:2 concanavalin (1) 46:4 concentration (3) 23:19:54:19:73:6 concept (1) 65:19 concerned (1) 45:8 conclude (3) 34:21:38:12:40:16 concluded (2) 30:22;76:24 concluding (1) 9:1 conclusion (13) 11:11;15:11;21:2,3; 28:9,9,13,14;30:21; 34:17:36:3:39:25:57:6 conclusions (6) 11:17;13:17;15:5; 37:29;38:17;40:8 conditions (1) 16:15 conduct (2) 26:29:27:4 conducted (2) 22:30:26:29 conductive (1) 21:16 confused (1) 59:28 connection (1) 7:19 consensus (1) 21:26 consider (2) 10:5:32:24 considerably (2) 14:15;51:15 consideration (1) 35:6 considered (3) 5:12;10:15;65:10 constant (2) 25:14;72:20 constantly (1) 31:15 constructed (1) 21:16 contact (3) 13:4;65:15,17 contained (1) 59:10 context (1) 23:24 continue (2) 50:17:78:2 contra-(1) 9:4

Lewis G. Sheffield, Ph.D. March 14, 2014

contract (1) 61:23 contradictory (1) 9:3 contribution (1) 12:20 control (26) 15:28,30;16:17;17:1, 4;18:22;20:17;22:25, 29:23:7,15,16:26:8; 34:2;39:21;53:21,22; 59:7;63:20,30;66:9,18, 19:68:3:77:2.2 controlled (1) 11:20 controls (6) 14:20;54:12,20;55:7; 64:29;67:1 converging (1) 64:7 conversation (1) 4:4cooperation (1) 7:19 copied (1) 7:11 copies (1) 67:22 copper (1) 75:15 **copy** (10) 9:12.12.22:18:28.29: 56:17,19:60:6,7,9 copying (1) 60:10 corrections (1) 35:15 **Correctively** (1) 20:29 correctly (11) 21:15:25:1.30:35:5. 14:45:7,25:53:18,27: 57:26:69:13 correlated (1) 40:13 correspond (2) 64:13;69:29 cortisol (6) 20:1;26:30;44:2; 58:15,18,19 C-o-r-t-i-s-o-l(1) 20:2counsel (2) 70:26;78:5 couple (6) 30:24;51:8,9;52:12; 65:29;76:22 course (2) 43:7;61:9 courses (3) 4:8:43:13,13 court (2) 9:22:50:15

co-variance (4) 17:11.12:64:19.23 cover (1) 42:4 covers (1) 69:25 cow (18) 22:7,10,10;23:14; 27:3;34:5,5,5;36:9,22, 23:50:20,21:51:25: 52:4;57:15;61:14;66:8 **cows** (20) 11:20:17:1:21:28; 23:16;24:13,14;26:7,8; 31:22;37:6;53:20,22; 54:16;57:14;64:29; 65:2;66:17,19,19; 70:18 create (1) 22:6 CREB (3) 74:29:75:9.13 **CREB1**(1) 74:29 criteria (3) 10:19;14:14;15:4 critical (2) 35:10;37:4 criticize (1) 35:16 CROSS (3) 3:21:65:26:76:16 crossover (1) 65:28 culminate (1) 7:25 culminating (1) 75:5 culture (3) 46:12:50:22.23 current (12) 20:30;21:14,27;22:6, 7,10;28:11;31:16; 33:24;38:10;61:16; 63:21 currently (1) 67:23 currents (1) 30:8 cyclase (3) 71:30;72:8;75:2 c-y-c-l-a-s-e (1) 72:8 cyclic (3) 74:30;75:3,3 cyclically (2) 75:8,14 cyclin (2) 74:3,5 c-y-c-l-i-n (1) 74:3 cyclins (1)

cvtokines (1) 44:6 c-v-t-o-k-i-n-e-s (1) 44:7cytosol (2) 73:4,6 D daily (3) 24:17,18;27:8 dairy (9) 4:21;5:1,27;19:16; 21:1,28;28:12;32:1; 61:14 **Dam** (1) 19:25 damaging (3) 37:12,13;75:20 dangerous (1) 33:3 data (40) 9:17;11:17;12:15; 13:19,27;15:10,14; 21:11;23:14;27:13,13, 16,22,22;29:18,20,23, 26;31:8;33:29;37:28; 40:7;42:9;46:1;55:19; 56:8,15,16,19;57:3,6; 65:6:66:30:67:5,9,18, 19;68:15;76:23;77:8 date (2) 26:23:79:28 day (2) 25:5,6 days (2) 27:4;33:18 dealing (3) 49:10:66:3.15 debatable (1) 63:12 debate (1) 35:13 decide (1) 16:1 decided (4) 13:27;15:16;26:18; 61:6 decisions (1) 15:29 define (3) 5:16:6:13:30:23 degrading (1) 74:26 degree (10) 4:15,17;10:4;11:12, 18,19,28;13:18;37:29; 40:8 delivered (2) 21:14,19 **Department** (2) 5:1,21 dependent (2)

74:3.6 depending (1) 38:22 depends (3) 5:16:39:7.8 deposition (2) 60:8:79:5 describe (8) 42:7;43:6,25;47:14; 48:12:55:19:68:26; 69:9 described (9) 45:28:54:1,3,5,6,17; 66:17;68:15;77:6 describes (1) 64:28 design (6) 21:20;65:28;66:1,3, 17:67:2 designing (1) 42:8 detached (1) 31:24 detaching (1) 31:19 detail (4) 42:5;46:2;47:14; 54:5 detailed (2) 28:3;66:29 details (5) 8:24,26;27:19;48:9; 66:26 detect (6) 30:20,25;38:14; 47:29:69:18,19 detectable (1) 53:27 detected (2) 30:12:48:2 detecting (2) 18:24:69:19 detector (2) 47:23;48:1 determine (1) 58:5 determined (3) 26:11;49:24;56:6 determining (1) 26:10 detoxify (1) 75:21 development (6) 4:22,26;5:7,15; 40:20;41:2 dictory (1) 9:5 difference (28) 10:16;11:26;17:15; 23:16:27:14,18,20,27; 28:4:34:17,27:35:22; 39:1.3.16.18.24.30: 50:18:56:10:59:6.29;

Volume 1

60:27:63:24:64:4:69:9, 18.20 differences (6) 16:19.21:26:7.8: 27:17.26 different (47) 5:20;11:23,25;12:19; 16:1.3.6.6.8.9.11.14: 18:19,20;19:4,8,9; 22:5;24:14,15,18,19, 19,27;27:25;30:25; 45:12;49:12;58:1,4; 63:26,28;64:17,28; 65:2.2.21.29:69:15: 70:17,17;71:28;73:15, 28;74:1,2;75:1 difficult (3) 26:29;30:20;38:14 difficulty (1) 29:12 digest (1) 47:21 digestive (2) 12:28,29 direct (1) 7:14 directed (1) 52:21 direction (1) 45:5 directly (4) 60:14:64:15.25:70:1 discuss (2) 32:29:67:6 discussed (3) 25:11;32:7;70:26 discussing (2) 48:18;59:18 Discussion (7) 34:8;42:24;48:13; 52:8;59:23;71:6;77:28 disease (15) 30:18;37:21;38:6,8, 14,18,23,23;39:28,30; 40:2,9,12,14;51:28 diseases (1) 40:1 **Disintegrations (4)** 46:8,18;48:5;69:27 disk (2) 57:3;67:12 disliked (1) 40:24 Dismutase (1) 75:16 D-i-s-m-u-t-a-s-e (1) 75:16 distinction (1) 48:19 distinguish (1) 69:6 distributed (2) 72:26;74:28

diverging (1) 11:6 division (1) 7:2**DNA (6)** 7:11:46:13,13:72:24: 75:8.10 doctor (13) 3:29;4:7;6:6;18:9; 34:13:36:6:40:5:41:9: 45:25;50:7,11;72:3; 77:30 doctoral (1) 4:23 document (1) 57:2 documents (2) 41:25;56:22 done (52) 7:19;8:20;12:8; 16:28;23:22;25:2; 28:21;29:5;42:22;43:8, 28;44:3,4,8;45:3,4,5; 46:20,29;48:24,25; 52:27;53:1,10,20; 56:11;58:4,7,8,11; 59:12;60:25,26;61:10, 10,11,29;63:11;64:9, 18,22,25;65:2,9;66:5, 13,19,24,27,29;76:23; 77:11 double (1) 43:4 doubt (1) 28:28 doubted (1) 28:27 Doug (1) 8:2 **Douglas** (1) 5:21 down (7) 10:24;49:1,17;50:11; 51:10,12;64:1 downgrade (1) 74:24 dozen (1) 39:29 dozens (1) 35:20 **DPM (2)** 46:5:49:6 Dr (24) 3:25;4:24;5:21;7:20; 8:19,23;13:29;14:2,3; 19:18,26,27;22:18; 28:24;30:5;31:29; 33:19;40:5;44:3;48:23, 27;67:8;71:8;76:21 draft (4) 62:25;70:25,26;77:6 drafting (2) 48:24,25

Min-U-Script®

74:4

draw (6) 34:24:53:21 11:17;13:17;24:25; electric (5) 37:29:40:7:57:14 drive (1) electrical (9) 4:11drop (1) 37:26 16 drop- (1) 30:5 drop-off (1) 30:15 drops (1) 11:4 drug (1) 52:28 duce (1) 74:20 due (7) 10:21,22;34:11; 35:22,23,24;40:16 duly (2) 3:12,18 duplication (1) 69:14 duration (2) 26:13,22 during (2) 72:26;75:18 E earlier (5) 34:14;59:16;68:15; 75:1:78:6 Early (6) 7:16;8:19,20;9:1,19; 22:13 earth (2) 21:27;22:6 easier (1) 40:29 easily (2) 57:28;73:22 easy (3) 10:27;12:7;57:26 editor (2) 14:12,29 editorial (1) 14:9 educational (1) 4:13 effect (15) 10:2;16:4;17:6; 18:22;21:1;28:12;32:1; 39:8,22;63:24,25,28; 66:13,15;77:21 effectively (2)

electricity (3) 21:23;40:10;77:5 electrocuting (1) 33:1 electrodes (3) 31:14,19,24 electronic (1) 56:15 element (2) 74:30;75:8 elevate (3) 53:12,24;72:28 Elevated (4) 51:27,30;58:20; 72:26 elevation (2) 11:4;53:25 else (6) 44:12,16;53:16; 67:16;71:10;78:7 enable (1) 13:19 end (6) 16:22:33:25,27; 43:27:57:2:74:16 energy (1) 72:21 engineer (1) 21:18 **Engineering** (3) 5:21;7:22;26:20 engulfs (1) 47:21 enjoyable (1) 40:30 enough (15) 13:28,28;14:21,22; 32:30;40:2,15;45:22; 52:1;65:14;70:19; 75:25;76:4,11;77:25 ensure (1) 16:25 enters (1) 6:25 entire (2) 62:9.12 entirely (4) 22:2;55:21;62:3; 76:10 entitled (1) 61:13 entity (2) 8:14:36:16 31:2;38:4;40:9;75:4 environment (3) 37:9:61:14:73:30 environmental (1)

17:5 enzyme (5) 22:6,8,9;31:15;53:15 71:30:73:1.12.14.16 enzymes (4) 21:28:28:11:30:7.18: 75:5,20,21;76:13 32:1:36:3:38:13:61:14, equal (2) 15:30;55:7 equipment (2) 44:11,14 erratic (1) 7:30 error (18) 15:19:16:8,10,12,14; 31:7;34:15,22,25; 35:11;38:30;39:2,2,4,7, 11,12,21 errors (3) 16:10;34:11;35:20 escape (1) 21:23 essentially (3) 4:20;31:14;53:26 establish (2) 13:16,26 et (1) 23:27 evaluate (1) 14:27evaluated (1) 14:17even (9) 18:23:28:8:34:27: 38:19:39:15:52:11: 56:30:60:20:73:22 event (2) 15:16;68:5 events (1) 72:27 eventually (1) 9:17 exact (4) 26:23;27:20;52:25; 62:4 exactly (7) 8:29;10:14;26:14; 55:22;62:21;72:17; 75:23 **EXAMINATION (2)** 3:21:41:19 **EXAMINATIONS (1)** 3:4 examines (1) 8:15 examining (1) 38:15 example (24) 6:21;12:24,30;14:21; 15:12,27;16:30;17:3; 20:21;25:17;27:8;33:3; 36:12,23;38:26;44:6; 52:11,27;63:8;64:3; 69:21,22;70:4,13 except (3)

Volume 1

4:3;37:25;79:6 exception (1) 10:25 excited (1) 14:4 exciting (1) 14:6 Excuse (6) 24:3;32:15,23;49:11; 50:13:67:8 EXHIBIT (33) 3:1;9:11;18:27;20:6; 21:25;22:24;24:6;30:5; 41:23:42:1.10:43:20: 54:17:56:12,13:59:5, 21,29,30;60:18,25,28; 61:1,5,13;62:20,24,25; 63:14;64:12,14;66:28; 71:9 exhibits (2) 9:25;60:29 exist (1) 52:10 existed (1) 4:2expect (10) 13:5;24:15,18;30:26; 36:22,24,29;52:4,6; 60:3 expensive (1) 44:15 experi- (1) 8:7 experience (1) 14:28 experiment (11) 14:21;15:12,27;17:8, 13:30:14:35:12:39:23: 65:21;66:1;68:14 experimental (1) 8:12 experimentation (1) 15:10 experiments (3) 39:6;67:4;69:6 expert (2) 3:17;14:12 expertise (2) 8:27,29 explain (8) 7:6:10:9:15:20.26: 20:3:46:8:69:23:71:9 explained (4) 15:23;34:14;49:18; 50:29 explaining (1) 38:30 exposed (5) 5:27;22:7;37:7; 54:21:63:21 exposeure (1) 28:10 exposure (9)

Lewis G. Sheffield, Ph.D. March 14, 2014

10:3;20:29;26:16,16; 31:13:32:1:33:25: 38:13:61:16 express (2) 7:10:74:1 expressed (1) 72:19 expressing (2) 51:21,23 expression (4) 5:14;29:15;75:6,10 extend (1) 25:2 extended (2) 25:13,16 extensive (1) 60:26 extent (1) 25:13 extra (1) 60:9 extrapolating (1) 25:23 extreme (1) 46:1 extremely (1) 75:17 F facing (1) 50:16 fact (6) 6:26;9:3;16:11;47:1; 66:13,23 factor (6)

39:20;51:19,19;55:1; 59:30:72:23 factors (3) 26:21:39:8:70:3 faculty (1) 4:30 fair (10) 40:5;62:17;65:14; 66:20;70:18,19;75:25; 76:4,11;77:25 fairly (4) 10:24;66:15;71:27; 72:19 false (3) 30:27,28:31:1 familiar (9) 6:12;22:15,16,17; 43:17;52:1,14;56:22, 23 family (1) 74:6 far (9) 4:10;15:14;27:30; 34:18:37:6:60:13; 71:17;73:23;77:10 **FAS (2)** 75:28;76:5

12:17;47:30

28:26:30:6.13.18:

16:2;20:26;22:8;

effects (8)

either (5)

F-A-S (1) 75:25 FASLigand (1) 76:5 feasible (2) 18:15:29:6 fed (1) 25:6 felt (4) 19:27:33:3:42:13; 58:1 few (4) 40:15,15;58:28; 72:27 Fewer (1) 58:30 field (6) 14:26;22:7,8,8,9,9 fields (2) 21:29,29 Figure (1) 11:3 figures (2) 11:2;63:17 file (1) 9:10 filled (1) 63:19 Final (4) 61:14,17,19;76:15 find (10) 7:28:10:27:13:5: 39:30:40:29:52:4,6; 67:17;68:27;72:12 finding (1) 14:25 findings (2) 7:29:15:6 fine (3) 41:15:65:25:75:12 finish (2) 12:1:72:4 finishes (1) 12:3 first (15) 3:18;9:25;16:28; 17:7;21:26;27:24; 28:25;31:27;42:6;46:3; 47:5;51:1;71:16;73:11; 74:25 flat (1) 11:5 flip (3) 34:29,30;35:1 floor (2) 21:17,19 flow (1) 22:7 flows (1) 22:10 focus (2) 5:9:21:30 focused (1)

22:14 focusing (2) 16:15.19 fold (1) 68:3 Follow (2) 34:18:63:17 followed (1) 8:13 following (3) 3:12;57:12;64:9 follows (2) 3:19:79:7 follow-up (1) 58:29 food (1) 4:19foregoing (1) 79:4 foreign (1) 36:14 forever (1) 68:7 form (11) 11:15;12:2;13:20,30; 16:18;25:27;29:19; 31:4;36:30;40:11; 67:29 format (1) 62:21 forms (3) 12:19:69:20:75:1 forth (3) 13:2:25:4:42:9 F-o-s (1) 72:22 found (10) 11:7,7;12:26,27; 30:23:40:14:72:10: 73:21,27,30 four (7) 35:21:67:15,20:68:2, 12.20:77:9 free (1) 25:23 free-stall (1) 21:12 freezer (1) 27:1 frequently (2) 73:30:74:25 Friday (1) 78:1 front (2) 60:28;61:13 full (4) 5:4;21:26;23:12; 40:18 full-time (3) 43:29:44:4,8 function (18) 5:27;6:1,3;7:5;15:6; 20:8,12;21:1;24:7;

28:12:32:2:36:4.25; 51:25:58:25:59:3: 61:15:62:17 functions (5) 7:9;36:19;42:7,15: 75:14 further (1) 13:25 G G4(1) 12:19 garbage (4) 29:15,15,17,17 gave (3) 36:10,23;68:2 gene (6) 5:13;69:14;71:27; 72:16;74:10,28 general (5) 5:25;31:25;61:29; 71:27;72:16 generally (8) 10:4,14;15:1;36:21; 38:24;42:21;61:28; 66:16 generated (3) 29:18,21;31:8 genes (9) 7:4.8:30:24:69:13: 70:8;72:25;75:6,7,10 genetics (4) 5:9,13,16;25:4 genital (1) 13:2 geometric (1) 55:15 gets (1) 37:14 Given (1) 65:8 gives (2) 47:27;53:8 glance (1) 73:11 gland (8) 4:22;5:7,15;13:1; 40:20;41:2;58:20; 73:13 glass (2) 46:26;71:24 globulin (1) 12:18 glucocorticoid (1) 58:19 glucose (4) 23:19;76:15,16,19 g-l-u-t-a-t-h-i-o-m-e (1) 76:12 Glutathione (1) 76:12 God (1)

Volume 1

9:26 goes (3) 33:13:34:25:68:20 gold (2) 21:7:32:24 good (8) 6:22;35:3;36:7,8; 38:29:56:12:78:1.13 gothing (1) 11:14 grades (1) 73:1 graduate (4) 8:25;43:11,29,30 grants (1) 40:28 grasp (1) 14:24 great (2) 7:29;35:13 greater (4) 10:4;32:16;34:26; 36:29 group (25) 6:14;16:17,30;17:4, 4;22:25,25,28,29;23:7, 7;24:13,14;34:2,3; 37:22,23;63:20,21,30; 64:1,29;66:9;74:4;77:3 groups (5) 15:28;16:22;17:16; 64:28:70:17 guess (6) 5:15;21:9,11;28:1; 34:14:35:29 guy (1) 19:21 Η half (1) 41:10 halfway (1) 68:30 hand (1) 50:11 handed (1) 56:13 happen (2) 31:21:33:15 happened (1) 7:27 happens (3) 36:12,18;74:25 hard (2) 12:6;45:22 harder (1) 14:23 Harlow's (2) 33:18,19 Harry (1) 33:18 head (5)

Lewis G. Sheffield, Ph.D. March 14, 2014

13:21:37:1:52:10,19; 76:1 health (4) 30:7,11,13;38:13 healthy (1) 37:7 heard (4) 3:29:17:29:18:8; 29:15 heat (1) 6:14 held (2) 71:6;77:28 help (3) 6:7;9:16;67:13 helps (1) 25:12 hence (1) 47:27 herd (3) 24:11,23;25:3 herds (3) 24:17,20;25:14 hereby (1) 79:3 hertz (1) 28:11 heterogeneous (1) 45:12 h-e-t-e-r-o-g-e-n-e-o-u-s (1) 45:13 heterostevasticity (1) 45:9 highest (1) 17:1highly (1) 41:1 hired (1) 56:18 hold (3) 72:29;77:8,9 hope (3)53:17;71:17;75:11 hoped (1) 24:5 hopefully (1) 53:14 Hopes (1) 33:15 hoping (1) 17:19 hormone (4) 20:1;72:9;73:24; 76:6 hormones (1) 72:14 hour (1) 41:10 house (1) 17:3 housed (3) 17:2:25:19.21 huh (1)

Star Blends, et al.				March 14, 201
22.15	20.11.15.16.17.10.	indianted (5)	interact (2)	itama (1)
33:15	20:11,15,16,17,19;	indicated (5)	interact (2)	items (1)
human (4) $59.5, 5, 7, 9$	21:1;22:22;24:7;28:12;	19:15;44:22;56:18;	21:27;22:9	62:16
58:5,5,7,8	32:2;36:4,11,17,18,25;	59:2,20	interaction (1)	IV (1)
humans (3)	37:11,11,16,21,24,30;	indicates (2)	64:2	76:16
52:21;57:27;58:14	38:5;47:21;51:25;	51:5;54:24	interactions (1)	T
hundred (9)	58:22,25;59:3;61:15;	indicating (6)	73:29	J
18:17;30:24,26;	71:30;72:12	9:10;19:1,3,7;55:3;	interacts (1)	
34:29;35:2;59:2;68:22,	immune's (1)	64:18	47:26	job (3)
24;71:2	20:8	indicators (1)	interleukin (41)	38:29;40:29;65:13
hypo (1)	immunity (6)	20:7	32:8,12;44:7,7;	John (2)
51:5	12:22;13:10,12,15,	indirectly (1)	51:15,17,18,18,24,27,	45:25;79:5
hypotheses (1)	26;75:17	70:2	30;52:4,9;53:6,8,12,24,	joined (1)
34:12	immuno- (2)	individual (2)	29;54:8;55:6;57:11,21,	4:30
	12:17;43:14	35:12;45:8	23;58:5,6;69:3,4,7,19,	joint (1)
Ι	immunoglobulin (4)	industries (1)	21,30;70:4,5,7,9,10,10,	40:6
	10:26;12:16,18,20	4:19	11,16,21,21	journal (2)
ICCUC (1)	immunoglobulins (3)	infancy (1)	interleukins (6)	14:15;62:30
8:7	6:2;12:19,21	28:30	6:2;7:10;57:23,26;	journals (2)
idea (1)	immunological (4)	infection (3)	68:27;69:12	14:9,10
35:17	52:22;57:27;58:13;	36:5,13;57:24	intermediate (1)	journal's (1)
ideas (1)	62:17	infections (1)	7:12	14:14
11:24	immunologist (2)	37:14	interpret (4)	judgment (4)
identified (1)	5:12;20:24	inferences (1)	55:22,30;56:11;70:7	14:12,13;65:5,5
20:8	immunologists (1)	15:13	interpretation (1)	J-u-n (1)
identify (1)	53:2	inflammation (4)	10:13	72:30
20:9	immunology (10)	36:5;37:13;51:29;	interpreting (1)	junior (1)
Ig (1)	5:9,10,10,24;6:16;	57:24	12:15	40:22
12:16	20:11;43:7,12;52:12,	inflammatory (2)	interrupt (6)	
IgA (22)	20	51:28;52:3	5:2;12:5,10,11;	Κ
10:26,29;11:8,21,27;	impact (1)	inflicted (1)	25:11;45:19	
12:14,16,26;13:6,10,	36:4	23:20	interrupted (1)	keep (1)
13,14;27:14;37:26,26;	impacts (2)	influences (2)	6:11	73:5
38:20;50:24,29;60:14,	36:3;38:13	39:12,20	intestine (1)	keeping (1)
19,19,20	impede (1)	ing (1)	12:24	33:15
IgG (7)	75:8	63:11	into (10)	kept (1)
49:28;50:18,19,21,	imply (1)	inhibit (2)	7:11;13:8,8;15:25;	67:22
23;51:15;59:13	9:4	20:20.23	35:6;36:16;46:16;	kill (1)
IgGs (1)	importance (1)	initial (10)	65:12;69:11;72:15	47:26
59:18	12:21	6:16;16:25,28;17:10,	introduce (1)	kinase (8)
II (2)	important (13)	20;61:18;62:1,5,8;	38:8	71:27;73:8,12,14,15,
41:5;57:10	6:15;12:15;17:8;	71:17	introducing (2)	16;74:4,6
III (5)	36:9;37:10,19;39:2;	initially (4)	4:6;36:14	k-i-n-a-s-e (1)
56:14,20;57:7;61:15;	40:12;63:27;71:21,28;	5:3,29;62:2;74:10	introduction (1)	73:8
62:11	72:9;75:17	initials (1)	21:23	Kind (2)
IL (1)	include (1)	75:25	invader (1)	34:29;37:4
57:11	61:6	injury (1)	6:24	Kirby (3)
IL1 (2)	included (4)	23:19	invert (1)	6:7;12:6;79:5
12:13;51:1	18:21,23;29:26;	inside (1)	54:29	knew (2)
IL1a (1)	43:13	73:24	involve- (1)	4:2;37:7
69:1	including (3)	instance (3)	61:26	knowledge (2)
IL1b (1)	32:2;47:15;66:24	7:10;39:29;40:2	involved (12)	19:13;21:6
69:1	inconsistent (1)	Institutional (1)	22:19;28:23;38:25;	
IL2 (1)	7:30	8:11	43:20;53:4;61:26;67:5;	known (3)
12:13		instrument (2)		37:7;64:18;69:23
	incorporated (1)		73:5,24,28;75:22;	т
ill (1)	46:16 Increase (2)	47:29;48:3	76:14	L
36:22	Increase (2)	insufficient (1)	involvement (1)	I-h (2)
imagine (1)	32:11;75:6	37:28	61:27	Lab (3)
13:13	independent (3)	insult (2)	involving (1)	8:5;29:12;44:13
immediately (2)	26:9;28:3;66:29	38:1,3	44:6	label (1)
31:25;33:24	INDEX (1)	intensity (2)	isotope (1)	60:14
immune (39)	3:1	69:24,29	46:14	labeled (2)
5:27;6:1,3;7:5,7;	indicate (3)	intentionally (2)	issue (2)	56:17;62:13
13:7;18:12,19,21;	23:16;38:21;72:6	36:10,13	35:7;68:11	laboratory (2)
	1	1	1	i la

Volume 1

23:14:42:14 5:4:59:11:68:30 laborious (1) Legal (1) 27:12 67:26 labs (1) legs (1) 44:15 31:14 lack (2) LeMire (4) 23:15;32:24 lagged (1) less (11) 71:22 large (12) 10:25;13:6;18:16; 37:22;38:22 leukocytes (3) 34:12:35:24,28:38:15, 24;39:25;40:3;74:14; 51:18,20,20 75:19 level (3) larger (4) 7:4;11:4;72:20 36:19;38:25;39:10; levels (10) 5:30;11:8;27:1; 70:6 largest (1) 39:5 27;55:14;58:6 last (15) LEWIS (2) 20:28;23:12,12; 3:16;79:3 24:22;26:6;30:17; life (3) 31:27;36:2;40:18; 31:13;40:24,28 58:15;67:15,20;68:2, ligand (1) 12;76:11 76:6 light (7) late (2) 56:16;57:5 Later (4) 69:24,25,29 7:3;17:14;58:29; liked (2) 66:9 29:5;58:30 latter (2) likely (8) 26:25.26 Lawrence (26) 3:8;9:16,26;11:14; 38:14 12:2,5,10:13:20,30; limits (1) 16:18;18:1;25:10,27; 25:16 29:19:31:4:33:17.21; line (12) 36:30:40:11:41:9.21; 49:9;56:26;77:30;78:5, 13 68:4:79:7 laws (1) lines (13) 33:19 lawsuit (2) 3:30:4:1 lawyers (1) lining (4) 12:24,30;13:1,1 4:3 lead (2) list (4) 48:21;49:2 leading (9) literally (1) 11:15;13:20,30; 46:26 16:18:25:28:29:19: literature (1) 36:30:40:11:61:22 25:30 least (12) little (14) 8:1;14:12,24;19:11; 20:6;29:6;34:25,27; 35:13,28;36:24;67:18 68:24;71:10,11 leave (1) living (2) 41:13 Lectin (1) 4:7;27:3 6:30 lobby (1) lectins (2) 4:6 6:28.29 local (1)

located (1) 44:16 log (1) 45:15 logarithm (11) 44:27,28,30;45:5; 8:21,22;19:21;60:13 54:21,29;56:2,4,7,8,9 logarithmic (4) 44:23;45:27;50:2; 10:5;25:20,24;27:30; 32:9,10,12;35:2,2; 64:10 logical (1) 43:15 long (7) 15:24;21:15;25:18; 43:28;56:24;69:11; 71:12 long- (1) 38:20;51:25,27;53:15, 30:19 longer (3) 41:12;67:28;74:24 look (26) 9:7;10:24;11:2; 14:26;20:28;24:1;28:9; 33:9;34:7;35:26,29; 37:15;38:26;39:29; 41:24;52:25;53:6;54:7; 47:27,30,30;48:2; 56:22,23;60:6;62:2,20; 63:16,22,22 looked (6) 17:24,26;25:19; 37:17:56:24:69:11 13:3:30:19.20.30: looking (17) 31:5:32:19:35:23: 9:9.10:17:20:18:13; 22:4;27:28;39:9,11,22; 43:9:49:13,15:50:15; 54:19,28;60:4;63:9 looks (8) 24:29;44:22;54:15, 33:1;37:5,6,18,18, 25;38:3;53:8;63:19,20; 26;55:9;68:16;75:25; 77:4 lot (12) 10:26;11:5,5;12:23; 7:28:25:11:28:26; 37:27;63:18,29,29; 29:3;38:16,27;39:21; 64:6;67:15,20;68:2,12 43:13;57:30;71:13,28; 72:12 low (3) 39:7;73:4,6 42:11;48:17;49:1,17 lower (2) 11:21;74:21 lowest (1) 17:2 Low-Level (1) 61:15 4:2;5:10,16;14:23; luminescence (4) 47:12,15;48:1,3 38:2;39:16;53:26;54:8; 59:28;60:11;66:21; l-u-m-i-n-e-s-c-e-n-c-e (1) 47:13 luminol (2) 47:23,27 l-u-m-i-n-o-l (1) 47:24 luminometer (1) 47:30

lungs (1) 13:1 Lyman (1) 8:23 lympho (1) 32:3 lymphocite (1) 27:11 Lymphocyte (2) 32:4;49:23 Lymphocytes (13) 6:15,15,17,19;7:1; 46:11:47:16:49:22; 53:11,21;73:28;74:1,1 lymphoid (1) 13:6 Μ machinery (1) 44:11 Madison (2) 4:9;25:3 magnetic (3) 21:29;22:8,9 magnifying (1) 71:24 magnitude (2) 36:20;51:10 mail (1) 78:6 main (4) 46:3;47:4;48:11; 72:21 major (9) 6:5;10:25;12:17; 13:9;20:14;35:7;36:18; 42:7:75:14 makes (7) 12:6,20;17:12,19; 27:20:32:27:75:11 making (5) 35:8;43:24;45:15,26: 66:9 mammary (8) 4:22,26;5:7,15;13:1; 40:20;41:2;73:13 man (1) 12:6 managed (1) 24:23 management (4) 24:11,18,26,27 manner (2) 42:22;65:7 many (16) 12:23,30;20:18;23:4; 35:26,28;39:22;46:18; 47:3;48:2;58:24,24; 71:16,23;72:10;73:19 mark (3) 9:11,20,22 markers (1)

20:7masters (1) 4:17master's (1) 4:17mastitis (1) 38:26 MATC(1) 4:9 material (1) 68:2 materials (2) 67:9,12 math (3)54:7;55:20,28 mathematics (1) 66:16 mats (1) 21:16 matter (3) 3:17;14:13;28:22 may (18) 21:18;22:15;25:7,7; 27:24,26;40:13;44:16; 49:18;61:10;63:1;66:4; 68:5,13;71:13;72:11; 78:2,11 Maybe (8) 10:9;15:1;56:30; 68:6;71:2;72:19;74:18, 19 mean (32) 5:2;9:4;10:1;11:13, 16;14:7,16;15:8;18:1; 25:11,14;26:19;27:14; 34:12;46:7;47:6;54:12, 13,20;55:7,10,18,29, 30;56:1,6,9;59:6;63:7; 68:3,3;69:22 meaning (2) 20:12:30:23 means (12) 6:14;11:6;32:21; 38:17;47:15;51:18; 55:15;56:5;59:30; 69:24;70:9,10 meant (1) 44:19 measure (13) 5:23;17:17;34:15,23, 26;40:12;42:12,13,13; 50:21:57:28.30:58:2 measured (11) 6:4,17,26;7:4;34:16; 40:13;46:14,17;50:23; 53:25;55:26 measureing (1) 53:28 measurement (2) 17:12:58:3 measurements (7) 15:28;18:16,17;20:5; 42:14,21:57:15

17:5

left (3)

Star Blends, et al.	1		1	March 14, 2014
	12.25.14.16.24.12.15.	madification (1)		24.18.17 27.20.6 7.
measures (7)	13:25;14:16;24:13,15;	modification (1)	nature (2)	24;18:17,27;20:6,7;
14:19;32:2;34:10;	39:1;43:30;73:12	15:1	52:27;62:4	21:25;22:24;27:21;
36:25;37:5;40:14;	Mileage (1)	molecule (1)	near (1)	30:27;32:20;34:12;
69:26	4:12	7:12	60:20	35:24,25;38:24;39:5;
measuring (11)	milk (7)	molegus (1)	necessarily (7)	43:25;44:29;45:1,1;
5:26,29;17:14;34:20;	17:1;25:5;30:6,9,15;	69:13	11:13;13:12;24:25;	47:10;48:4;50:3;54:22,
46:13,15;49:6;53:10,	34:20,21	moment (9)	37:2;52:20;58:21,23	30;55:6,12,13,15,18;
11;64:2;65:8	Milked (2)	23:23;41:24,25;	need (6)	56:3,7;59:9,13,19,20,
meausred (1)	25:6;31:23	49:14;64:27;68:6,27;	7:9;22:6;38:16;	29;64:21;70:3,6,9;
23:19	milliamp (2)	76:21;77:26	71:23;74:23,23	74:14;79:7
mechanisms (1)	20:30;28:11	monitor (1)	needed (2)	numbered (2)
73:24	milligram (1)	8:12	44:12;74:25	10:27;34:7
medicine (1)	51:9	monkeys (1)	needs (1)	numbers (21)
71:23	milligrams (3)	33:9	14:30	10:1,8,24;18:16;
meet (1)	49:30;50:10,26	more (30)		27:26;30:12;39:26;
			negatives (1) 43:4	
15:3	milliliter (7)	23:6;26:20;30:19;		40:4;44:24;54:9,12;
meets (2)	49:30;50:9,27;51:2,	32:19;33:19;34:26;	neutrophil (1)	56:10;60:3;63:7;64:13;
8:7;14:14	9;54:20;69:28	35:23;38:8,16,21;	47:20	68:1;69:22;70:20;
membrane (2)	milliliters (1)	39:16,23;40:26,30;	neutrophile (1)	75:19;76:27,28
72:14;76:17	70:14	45:24;51:11,15;55:17;	6:4	nursing (1)
membranes (2)	Milo (2)	58:28,30;60:11,25;	neutrophils (1)	41:4
73:2;76:16	19:29,30	66:26;68:24;70:7,10;	47:24	
memory (2)	mind (1)	71:17;73:23;76:18,23	new (6)	0
21:21;45:7	12:5	morning (3)	29:8,9,23,25;43:16,	
ment (1)	mine (1)	42:24;62:24;70:27	23	oath (1)
61:27	14:3	Morten (1)	next (22)	3:19
menters (1)	mini (1)	19:25	18:11,30;27:7;28:21;	object (10)
8:8	35:8	most (19)	32:11;34:7;44:18;49:1,	11:14;12:2;13:20;
mentioned (5)	minimal (1)	10:24;12:26;13:3;	1,17,28;50:19,24;54:8;	14:5;16:18;25:27;
34:14;66:4,21;75:2;	32:1	14:9;17:8;23:9;32:2,	72:29;73:7,26;74:7;	
				29:19;31:4;36:30;
78:5	Minnesota (7)	23,23;34:10;38:6;	75:15,23;76:5,7	40:11
merely (1)	17:23;19:6,14;61:16,	39:14;40:1,14;44:3;	nitrogen (3)	Objection (1)
40:1	19,24;62:9	65:10;72:10;74:9,16	53:20,23,30	13:30
message (2)	minor (1)	mostly (5)	noisy (1)	objective (1)
37:26;73:3	12:20	5:11;17:17;41:4;	30:3	24:2
messenger (25)	minus (4)	47:19;68:29	None (2)	Objectives (2)
7:4,6,12,18;18:14,	51:5,12;54:22;59:6	much (10)	8:17;53:26	24:1,4
20;42:19;51:21;67:5;	minute (4)	12:24;29:30;36:19,	non-professional (1)	observation (4)
68:14;70:4,8;72:1,5,5,	46:8,19;48:5;69:27	29;38:8,24;46:15;	63:10	15:13;20:9;28:18;
24;74:8,9,11,11,16,17,	minutes (1)	51:11;53:25;65:15	nonspecific (1)	30:4
23,26;75:4	4:11	mucosal (8)	75:17	observations (1)
messure (1)	miristate (2)	12:22,22,25,27;	nor (1)	12:13
10:11	47:7,18	13:10,12,14,26	23:18	observe (1)
metabolism (2)	m-i-r-i-s-t-a-t-e (1)	multiple (3)	normally (3)	15:13
75:18;76:14	47:8	35:29;65:8,20	37:8;66:23;73:3	observed (2)
metabolisms (1)	misnomer (1)	multiplied (1)	Northern (1)	31:30;38:4
71:28	73:12	69:24	3:29	observing (1)
method (4)	missed (1)	muscle (1)	notes (2)	36:27
26:10;53:18;65:9,13	9:24	23:19	29:11,11	obtaining (1)
methodology (3)	Missouri (1)	myself (3)	notice (1)	61:23
			30:9	
14:19;64:17;77:20	4:21	5:12;26:27;37:4		Obviously (1)
methods (2)	mistake (2)	NT	noticed (1)	70:3
58:9;66:3	16:5,7	Ν	27:14	occasion (1)
mice (1)	misunderstanding (1)		noting (1)	31:24
33:10	59:22	name (4)	79:7	occasionally (2)
Michigan (1)	mix (1)	19:27;47:27;52:17;	novelty (1)	4:8;31:23
4:23	69:26	72:17	14:17	occasions (1)
microbiology (2)	mixed (2)	named (1)	nowhere (1)	66:24
41:5;43:14	46:28;60:29	73:19	60:20	occurred (1)
micrograms (2)	model (1)	natural (13)	nucleus (1)	46:19
50:9;69:28	66:25	44:27,30;45:4,15,26;	72:24	o'clock (1)
might (10)	modest (2)	54:21,29;56:2,4,6,8,9;	number (47)	78:15
might (10) 5:24;8:2;10:13;			number (47) 10:3,5,17,28;17:20,	78:15 off (13)

30:6;47:27;52:10,19; 56:14:67:12:71:6: out (16) 74:27;76:1;77:25,26. 28.30 often (13) 7:2;10:19;20:11; 26:27;43:5;51:27; outcome (1 57:24:58:20:71:22; 72:26;73:2,24;74:29 outcomes (old (3) 12:6;21:21;73:15 one (82) output (1) 6:8,26;10:25;12:14; 13:12;20:27;24:13,18; outside (1) 25:21;26:15,21,26,28; 27:22;28:16,17,17; over (7) 33:12,26,26;34:15,20, 24,24,25,27;35:4,15, 26,30;37:22;38:19; overall (2) 39:8;41:11;44:2,26; 45:17,24;46:22;47:18; over-corre 49:2,2,12,15,28;52:12, 16,17;54:6,9,9;55:26, overlap (1) 26;57:12,23;59:9;60:7, 7,28;61:5;62:6,12; overstatem 63:8,19;66:8;71:3,9,11, 25;72:13;73:20;74:12, overview (2 25;75:4,5,16,21,23,26; 76:18;77:18;78:9 own (1) ones (3) 17:2:43:21:71:19 oxide (1) only (12) 6:8;11:7;14:2;21:27; oxygen (4) 22:28:27:22:30:24: 35:21;38:5;41:4;67:30; 74:23 open (1) 63:20 opinion (3) page (35) 15:18:35:30:45:30 opinions (2) 14:2,3 opportunity (1) 27:5 opposed (3) 36:28;43:29;57:27 oranges (1) 59:24 order (4) pages (1) 51:8;62:24,30;68:29 orders (1) paginated (51:9 original (1) pair (1) 67:22 originally (1) paper (20) 42:2 originated (1) 69:14 Others (2) 6:28;12:30 papers (1) otherwise (1)

Г <u> </u>	Г <u> </u>
4.5	
4:6	23:12,23;24:22;26:7;
out (16)	31:27
7:9;25:10;29:15,17;	parallel (2)
30:23;42:1,8;44:1;	63:29;64:6
46:20;48:15,17;61:18;	paramaters (1)
67:9,17,19;73:5	70:22
outcome (1)	parameters (1)
35:27	21:30
outcomes (5)	parentheses (1)
17:21,24,27;35:20,	44:22
29	part (21)
output (1)	12:15;17:9,23;19:2;
48:2	24:11;47:25;48:21;
outside (1)	56:14,20;57:6,15;
72:7	58:26;61:8,15;62:10,
over (7)	13,13;67:27,28;71:19;
23:14;39:21;54:9;	74:6
63:4,23;65:12;68:3	particular (14)
overall (2)	6:27;14:26;23:30;
63:25,28	25:3;27:11;39:29;
over-corrects (1)	43:21;48:10;51:26;
35:16	52:7,14;53:7;68:27;
overlap (1)	75:12
4:26	particularly (2)
overstatement (1)	14:6;38:15
26:1	pass (1)
overview (2)	14:13
4:13;5:17	past (2)
own (1)	52:23;58:8
23:15	pathogens (1)
oxide (1)	37:8
75:16	pathway (1)
oxygen (4)	47:25
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21;	47:25 pathways (3)
oxygen (4)	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14	47:25 pathways (3)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35)	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15;
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35)	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5;
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9;
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28;
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11,	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16,
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15,
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1)	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1)	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1)	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22;
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11 paper (20)	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28 period (2)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11 paper (20) 7:25,25;9:17,19;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28 period (2) 33:25;43:28
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11 paper (20) 7:25,25;9:17,19; 14:8,10,13,30;24:2;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28 period (2)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11 paper (20) 7:25,25;9:17,19; 14:8,10,13,30;24:2;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28 period (2) 33:25;43:28 perish (1)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11 paper (20) 7:25,25;9:17,19; 14:8,10,13,30;24:2; 42:3;48:25;54:1,17;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28 period (2) 33:25;43:28 perish (1) 40:27
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11 paper (20) 7:25,25;9:17,19; 14:8,10,13,30;24:2; 42:3;48:25;54:1,17; 56:14,20;61:6,11,17;	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28 period (2) 33:25;43:28 perish (1) 40:27 peroxidase (1)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11 paper (20) 7:25,25;9:17,19; 14:8,10,13,30;24:2; 42:3;48:25;54:1,17; 56:14,20;61:6,11,17; 64:28;70:26	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28 period (2) 33:25;43:28 perish (1) 40:27 peroxidase (1) 76:12
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11 paper (20) 7:25,25;9:17,19; 14:8,10,13,30;24:2; 42:3;48:25;54:1,17; 56:14,20;61:6,11,17; 64:28;70:26 papers (1)	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28 period (2) 33:25;43:28 perish (1) 40:27 peroxidase (1) 76:12 p-e-r-o-x-i-d-a-s-e (1)
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11 paper (20) 7:25,25;9:17,19; 14:8,10,13,30;24:2; 42:3;48:25;54:1,17; 56:14,20;61:6,11,17; 64:28;70:26	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28 period (2) 33:25;43:28 perish (1) 40:27 peroxidase (1) 76:12
oxygen (4) 47:25;75:19,21; 76:14 P page (35) 9:28,30;11:3;21:25; 23:13;24:1,4,22,23; 25:12;26:6,11;27:13; 28:9;31:27;34:8;36:2; 41:25,26,28,29;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4; 62:22;63:3,18;64:12; 68:16,28;69:1;76:11, 21;79:7 pages (1) 68:20 paginated (1) 42:2 pair (1) 57:11 paper (20) 7:25,25;9:17,19; 14:8,10,13,30;24:2; 42:3;48:25;54:1,17; 56:14,20;61:6,11,17; 64:28;70:26 papers (1)	47:25 pathways (3) 20:21,22;72:13 peer (5) 14:8;21:5,7;28:27,28 people (4) 9:14;29:24;33:15; 43:25 per (14) 5:12;46:8,19;48:5; 49:30;50:9,26;51:2,9; 54:20;66:18;69:27,28; 70:13 percent (11) 10:20,21,22;34:16, 16,18,22,24;39:10,15, 17 performed (3) 43:18;44:30;70:25 perhaps (6) 7:6;9:16;30:22; 52:11;63:12,28 period (2) 33:25;43:28 perish (1) 40:27 peroxidase (1) 76:12 p-e-r-o-x-i-d-a-s-e (1)

Volume 1

27:8PETA (1) 33:15 ph (1) 45:10 phagocytic (4) 6:5,6,9,13 P-h-a-g-o-c-y-t-i-c (1) 6:9 phase (1) 46:19 PhD (6) 3:16,27,28;4:20; 19:25:79:3 Phorbol (2) 47:7,18 P-h-o-r-b-o-l (1) 47:8 phosphate (4) 73:13,17,20,21 photocopy (1) 67:12 phymidine (2) 46:14,16 p-h-y-m-i-d-i-n-e (1) 46:15 physical (1) 43:24 physically (3) 31:19;44:16;67:26 physiological (1) 5:23 physiologically (1) 73:23 Physiology (4) 41:4,5;43:12,14 phytochemagglutanin (1) 46:4 picking (2) 48:15,17 picograms (2) 51:2:70:13 picrograms (1) 54:19 place (1) 31:26 placed (1) 50:22 places (1) 72:12 please (6) 6:13:41:24:42:7: 46:10;48:12;59:27 **PMA (3)** 47:5,5,18 point (4) 22:18;35:4;40:24; 55:24 pointed (1) 63:13 Pokeweed (4) 6:28;49:18,21;54:21 poly (5)

Lewis G. Sheffield, Ph.D. March 14, 2014

74:7,8,13,26,27 poor (1) 36:11 population (1) 38:15 Portage (2) 4:9.10positives (2) 30:28;31:1 possess (1) 67:26 possibility (3) 13:15,24;35:6 possible (7) 14:10;16:24;23:4,10; 24:21;43:30;67:27 Possibly (1) 52:1 post (1) 4:23 Power (5) 3:30;38:28;54:30; 55:3.13 powerful (2) 23:3,6 practical (1) 39:6 predominantly (1) 5:7 prefix (1) 51:5 preliminary (1) 62:25 prepared (2) 63:1.1 presence (1) 46:12 present (1) 76:19 presented (1) 48:14 pre-treatment (3) 16:15,21,26 pretty (3) 18:22;23:11;30:12 previous (3) 31:28,30;32:6 previously (1) 69:17 primarily (1) 22:14 primary (3) 48:16,17,18 principle (1) 42:15 principles (1) 25:15 printed (1) 56:14 prior (1) 33:24 probability (2) 10:15:11:21

ourselves (1)

57:9

Star Blends, et al.			
	6 20 7 14 20 26	P (1)	
probably (15)	6:30;7:14;20:26;	radio- (1)	reasonably (1)
6:8;17:7;30:19;31:9;	51:19;69:15;72:6,9,23;	46:18	42:13
33:6,7,23;38:29;39:30;	73:17,18,18;74:21;	radioactive (1)	reasons (6)
42:18;48:9;49:10;	75:9	46:14	20:14;24:30;28:25;
61:11;65:10;72:10	proteins (11)	radioactivity (2)	35:4;48:10;71:23
problem (2)	6:1;7:10,11,17,18;	46:17;48:5	recall (33)
43:3;45:9	20:16,18;73:26;74:2,4;	raise (2)	5:19;8:23;19:19;
procedure (1)	76:18	54:30;55:13	21:15,19;25:9;30:16;
45:6	protocol (1)	random (5)	34:6;45:6;48:13,18,23;
procedures (1)	24:17	10:21,22;17:3;39:18;	53:9,26;57:25;58:12;
49:7	protons (2)	40:16	59:18,18,18,23;61:1,8;
	48:2,7	randomization (2)	62:30;66:4;68:5,13;
proceedings (1) 3:12	provided (2)	16:29;17:8	
			69:13;71:4,12,13; 75:22:76:1.2
process (4)	67:10,21	randomly (1)	75:23;76:1,3
7:15;27:6,7,9	Public (4)	16:29	receive (1)
processed (1)	19:6;61:17,19,24	ranges (1)	73:21
7:13	publica- (1)	10:12	received (3)
processes (6)	15:16	rapidly (1)	4:15,17,20
30:19;38:6,18;51:28,	publication (7)	37:16	recent (1)
28:52:3	8:1;13:29;14:11,14;	rare (1)	33:19
processing (2)	15:3;21:8;62:30	23:11	receptor (1)
74:12,13	publications (1)	rarely (1)	76:6
produce (2)	14:30	13:22	recess (1)
50:23;53:29	publish (1)	Rasmussen (1)	41:17
produced (6)	40:27	19:25	recognition (1)
47:25;51:19;56:15;	published (8)	rate (1)	73:29
57:4;58:19;67:19	7:25,28;8:2;9:18,19;	35:11	recognized (1)
produces (2)	28:24;42:3;61:6	rather (5)	6:19
75:2,19	publishing (2)	27:15;32:17;41:1;	recognizes (1)
producing (1)	14:4,5	50:9;57:29	36:11
72:18	pumping (1)	ration (1)	record (8)
production (12)	73:5	25:6	10:9;20:3;45:24;
7:16,17;17:1;20:22,	pure (1)	rats (1)	71:6;77:26,26,28;78:1
23;30:6,9,15;34:20,21;	40:26	33:10	recorded (1)
53:24;72:25	purpose (1)	raw (1)	79:5
profession (1)	8:10	56:8	records (1)
65:18	pursue (1)	ray (2)	52:24
professional (1)	8:1	29:1,8	RE-DIRECT (1)
65:15	put (2)	reached (2)	41:19
professor (6)	23:24;27:1	32:17;40:24	reducing (3)
5:4,4;19:15,18;	putting (1)	reaction (1)	17:18;23:5,6
40:18;61:22	6:22	36:29	ref (1)
progressed (1)	P-value (1)	read (2)	3:3
29:4	60:12	23:23;79:4	refer (3)
	P-values (1)	READING (1)	44:26;69:13;76:7
project (1) 18:11	27:29	79:1	reference (4)
	21.29		
proliferate (1)	0	real (2)	18:14;35:19;52:7,25
49:22	Q	31:13;38:8	references (2)
proliferation (2)		realize (2)	23:27;52:26
49:23;74:5	quantity (1)	62:21;71:12	referral (1)
promote (2)	70:16	really (16)	44:27
72:24;75:10	quite (12)	16:2,2,4,6,8,9,11,13,	referred (1)
pronounce (2)	19:26;20:24,26;	26;29:9;34:28;37:11;	69:3
32:3;74:29	26:29;33:4;39:19;47:3;	48:4;54:26;56:23;	referring (17)
pronounced (1)	58:28;65:22;72:27;	69:26	9:21,27;19:1;23:26,
32:4	74:17;75:28	reason (8)	30;24:7;26:13,14,21;
pronouncing (1)		29:22;37:2,2;39:5;	31:29;36:20,26;38:18;
35:5	R	48:10;57:8;75:12;79:8	65:28,29;66:8,11
proposal (3)		reasonable (12)	refers (6)
61:25;62:5,9	radical (1)	11:12,18,19,28;	28:5,8;32:6;52:8;
propylene (3)	76:14	13:18;18:17;37:29;	72:30;76:10
53:19,23,30	radicals (3)	40:8;43:12;46:2;77:19,	reflect (1)
protein (13)	47:25;75:19,21	20	13:12
protein (13)	+1.23,13.19,21	20	13.14

Volume 1

reflected (7) 21:10;24:2,5;27:18; 60:17;61:4;70:25 reflective (1) 13:14 reflects (1) 13:10 refresh (1) 26:26 regarded (1) 32:22 Regardless (1) 68:13 regulate (3) 6:3;51:20;74:5 regulations (1) 8:13 regulator (2) 75:14,29 regulators (2) 38:5,7 Reinemann (13) 5:21;7:20;8:19; 13:29;19:18,27;22:18; 23:27;30:5;31:29;40:6; 48:23,27 Reinemann's (4) 14:2,3;19:26;61:23 related (4) 5:11;18:20;24:11; 52:8 relates (1) 43:8 relating (1) 18:11 relationship (1) 5:15 relative (5) 47:12,15;48:1,3; 69:23 relatively (1) 36:4 relevant (1) 5:24 reliable (2) 29:26;71:20 reliably (3) 38:14;39:24;40:16 relied (1) 52:22 rely (2) 52:21;57:29 relying (1) 21:20 remember (3) 25:30;37:10;38:30 remembering (2) 21:18;53:18 repaired (1) 31:25 repeat (1) 24:16 repeated (1)

Min-U-Script®

(11) probably - repeated

Volume 1

. 66:2 replications (1) res 65:20 report (7) res 14:28:21:2.4.5: 27:24:36:2:61:15 res reported (2) 14:18:50:26 res **REPORTER (6)** 6:10:9:22:12:3; 45:11;50:15;67:7 reporting (1) res 14:17 represent (5) rev 3:29;54:12;56:13; 64:8;67:8 rev represents (2) 77:1,3 rev request (1) 61:25 rev require (1) 27:2 rhe required (1) 74:21 rid research (12) 5:22;8:25;11:11; rig 18:30;22:13,18;25:17; 28:21;33:13;40:25; 43:8.15 researcher (3) 2 4:23,25:5:20 researchers (3) 8:16:60:13:61:5 f residues (1) 74:15 rig respect (3) 42:16:46:3:71:2 RL respond (6) 6:17,20;37:21,24; RN 38:1.3 responds (2) 36:17:37:16 8 response (32) 6:26;20:8,15,17,17, RN 19;24:28;25:20;37:22; 38:5,9,9;46:3;47:4; RN 48:12;49:2,3,18;53:12, 29;56:16;57:4,24; 58:15,24;60:20;61:14, rol 15;62:3;67:19;74:30; 75:8 rol responses (15) 5:24;18:19,21;22:14, rol 20,22;24:15,19;25:16; 37:5;62:2,3;75:5,6,18 rou responsibility (3) 42:25;48:16,17 rov responsible (5) 42:11,30;44:2;72:17, rul 20 restate (1) rue 15:9 restricted (1)

71:29	
esult (1)	
38:12	
esulted (2) 42:9,26	same (39)
esulting (2)	9:17;11
56:2;68:15	16:2,3,4 27;17:1
esults (10)	21:11;2
16:23;20:29;25:2,13;	22;28:2
28:10;30:3,18,30;34:8;	42:1;49
35:25 esuts (1)	60:4;62
30:27	17,20;7 77:12,1
eveal (1)	sample (4
33:29	27:1,6,7
eview (4)	samples (
8:18;21:7;28:27,28 eviewed (2)	26:11,1
14:8;21:5	27:9;30
eviewers (4)	30;57:1 saw (4)
14:11,27;15:7,10	11:26;3
nesus (1)	53:25
33:9 d (2)	saying (6)
37:14;74:24	22:5;35
ght (33)	38:7,12 schedule
3:25;4:3;11:15,25;	76:24;7
14:19;21:20;23:25;	science (1
26:6;32:8;35:10;36:7;	4:15,16
45:4;48:10;51:6,14; 52:3;53:6;54:28;55:17;	5:1;8:5;
57:21;59:4;60:14;63:4;	16;21:2 scientific
64:27;65:3,19,23;68:5,	11:12,1
13,21,30,30;78:9	9;35:26
ghthand (1)	scores (1)
27:30 LU (1)	17:27
47:10	Scott (1)
NA (17)	9:24 se (1)
7:4,6,12;18:14;	5:12
42:19;67:5;68:14;70:5,	second (1
8;72:1,5,25;74:11,11, 16,22,26	17:10;2
NAs (6)	31:27;3 66:21;6
18:20;72:5;74:8,9,	77:3
17,23	secondary
NA's (1)	48:19;4
7:18 obust (1)	secreted (
38:8	13:8
ble (1)	secretions 13:8
74:22	section (1
oles (1)	53:18
71:28	seeing (3)
ound (1) 50:5	13:13;2
ow (1)	seem (1) 74:22
27:16	seemed (1
ubbing (1)	46:2
31:20	seems (2)
1dimentary (1) 27:28	29:11;6
21.20	self (1) 73:29
	13.29

S :22;15:30; 4,7,9,10,12,13, 3;19:3,11; 2:5;27:13,16, 25;37:27;39:19; :7:50:26:56:14; 2:21;65:20;66:1, 2:29;73:9; 4,14;79:6 D 7;50:20 (11) 2,15,18,30; 0:21;33:22,26,8 36:19:38:9: 5:16,19:36:6; (2)8:2 2) 5,18,20,21; ;17:23;19:15, 26;62:10 (10)8,19,28;14:7, 5,28;37:30;40:8 1) 21:25:23:12; 37:19:42:18: 57:4;68:13;75:3; y (2) 9:3 (1)s (1)) 22:4;57:8 1) 50:16 sheet (1)

self-signaling (1) 75:29 semester (1) 41:3 send (2) 14:27;78:7 sense (3) 17:19:67:29:75:11 sensitivity (1) 40:14 sent (3) 9:12:14:11:67:23 sentence (7) 20:28;21:26;23:12; 30:17;31:28;32:11; 38:18 separate (4) 66:2,14,24;77:11 sequence (1) 75:8 sequences (1) 69:15 series (5) 62:14;73:26;75:4,20; 76:27 serious (1) 33:5 Serium (1) 10:29 **Serum** (21) 10:26;11:27;13:10, 14:26:30:27:14:32:12: 49:28:50:19,20,21,24; 51:1,24;53:7,8;54:8; 57:11;59:13;60:14; 71:10 serve (1) 78:7 served (1) 32:28 serves (1) 45:7 service (1) 56:18 Services (1) 67:26 serving (1) 23:15 set (10) 7:7;27:16,22;38:5; 42:9:67:4,5:68:15: 69:6:77:14 sets (1) 77:14 seven (1) 67:11 several (8) 24:30;27:4;39:8; 44:15;45:17;47:17; 74:12:76:7 shared (1) 44:15

61:13 **SHEFFIELD (9)** 3:16.25:28:24:41:23: 56:29:67:9:71:8:76:21: 79:3 shock (2) 53:15:54:16 short (3) 32:30;43:9,10 show (5) 27:26;34:27;56:12; 58:21:60:26 showed (3) 11:20:33:30:35:21 shown (3) 28:26;59:15;63:18 shows (2) 25:20;55:11 Shuford (1) 4:24 sic (3) 42:25;62:24;70:27 side (2) 7:22,23 signal (1) 72:13 signaling (1) 73:24 signals (2) 18:25;72:14 **SIGNATURE (1)** 79:28 signifi-(1) 14:24significance (13) 10:4,11;11:22,23,29; 12:12:26:10:32:9,10, 12;51:24;60:21;69:10 significant (19) 7:29;8:9;9:3;10:6; 11:8;12:13,14;13:28; 20:30;23:13,18;28:12, 18,26;35:22,25;36:28, 28;39:13 SIGNING (1) 79:1 similar (3) 66:23;69:12,16 simple (4) 20:26;61:1,4;77:17 simpler (1) 66:22 simply (9) 6:14;15:11;27:7; 40:1,7,24;48:1;59:9; 66:29 single (1) 13:22 sit (1) 52:17 situation (3) 15:9:31:13:66:21 situations (3)

23:9,11:58:20 slight (2) 27:17.20 slightly (2) 27:25:69:15 small (13) 10:17;27:26;30:12, 20;35:25;36:4,21;38:5, 26;40:23;52:6;54:24, 26 smaller (2) 10:3;32:20 solid (1) 63:19 somatically (1) 74:15 somebody (2) 67:16;78:7 sometime (1) 5:19 sometimes (3) 13:8;15:23;73:19 somewhere (4) 31:9;44:16;54:2; 71:26 Sorry (9) 6:11;12:8;43:2; 45:20;46:20;50:8; 60:24;75:27;76:25 sort (1) 52:28 sounds (2) 26:19:31:10 source (1) 72:21 space (1)76:27 speak (1) 14:3 speaking (2) 42:21;61:28 special (2) 5:9;21:16 specialized (2) 40:19;41:2 specialty (2) 5:5;43:11 specific (5) 7:14,18;48:4;59:19; 76:17 specifically (3) 18:13;22:22;62:16 spectrum (1) 38:7 spell (2) 47:8;72:3 spelled (2) 6:7;20:19 spoke (1) 59:16 spurious (1) 18:25 stabilizing (1)

74:22 stall (2) 21:22:25:23 stalls (2) 21:16.20 stanchion (7) 21:12,13,19;25:3,25; 31:11.20 stand (2) 28:27,28 standard (9) 21:7;32:25;45:15,28; 52:11,15,20;66:15; 69:26 standards (1) 30:3 standpoint (1) 14:6 stands (8) 8:10;12:16;47:12; 73:7;74:30;76:1,2,15 staph (2) 28:1:49:26 staphylacoccus (1) 49:4 staphylococcus (3) 6:27;28:2,4 start (4) 13:23;17:12;56:28; 75:13 started (4) 18:14:25:9:28:29: 49:11 starting (1) 63:7 State (2) 4:23;25:30 statement (1) 66:20 States (1) 3:29 statistic (1) 60:25 statistical (23) 8:15,18,20;10:11; 11:23;26:10;27:18; 30:26;32:10;38:27; 42:26;44:30;45:9,28; 60:20;61:2;65:6;66:3, 6,16,25;70:24;77:20 statistically (13) 7:29:8:8:9:2:10:1.6: 11:8,26;12:14;14:20; 17:14,29;35:21;36:28 statistician (9) 8:27;10:13,14;17:18; 28:7;35:9;44:23;65:15; 66:27 statisticians (2) 35:14,16 statistics (17) 8:28,29;11:21;18:9; 19:22.23:27:19.29;

28:2:35:7:42:30:50:5: 61:10:63:9.11:65:19. 25 status (1) 51:25 stay (2) 31:25;76:21 staved (1) 4:16 steps (2) 74:12,13 Steve (3) 19:21:45:7,18 Steven (2) 8:21,22 stick (1) 68:6 still (4) 25:14;39:3;67:24,25 stimulant (2) 46:12;47:17 stimulants (1) 6:18 stimulate (3) 20:16,20,22 stimulated (1) 53:23 stimulates (3) 7:2:47:19:49:21 stimulation (2) 53:10,27 stored (1) 26:30 straight (1) 62:26 straighten (1) 25:10 stray (4) 5:11,18,22;22:13 stress (15) 5:25:23:18:24:10.15. 19:25:20,20,22,24,24, 25;33:5;58:20;62:2; 72:26 stresses (2) 40:25,28 strong (1) 36:23 strongly (3) 36:17;37:16,21 struggling (2) 24:29.30 student (3) 8:25:43:11.30 students (2) 41:5;43:29 studied (7) 7:16,17;58:25,28,30; 59:1;77:12 studies (14) 6:16:18:5.6:25:29; 35:26.28:36:3:38:27: 40:6;42:8,18;52:23;

Volume 1

53:10:58:26 study (52) 7:3:11:20:13:22: 14:6:16:26.28.29: 17:10.20.23:18:13: 21:10;23:26,30;24:2,5, 5;25:2;28:13,15,26,29; 30:21:31:28,29,30; 32:6;37:3,5,15;38:3,16, 23:39:28:40:2:43:19, 21;53:7;57:6,21,26; 58:4,29:61:18,29:62:1, 10;71:3,11,17;77:2,11 studying (3) 4:21;35:20;71:20 style (2) 24:26,27 sub (1) 69:7 subject (6) 14:13;28:21;43:9; 65:5,16,17 subjected (2) 24:11;33:20 subjects (2) 52:8;65:21 submission (1) 61:19 submitted (5) 14:10;19:6,14;61:16; 62:29 subpoena (7) 56:16:57:4:67:11.19, 22:78:6.8 subsequent (1) 63:2 subtract (3) 56:1,7;59:9 suburban (1) 40:22 sufficient (3) 37:28:40:7:78:6 sufficiently (1) 14:12 suggest (7) 13:24;20:29;25:29; 28:10;29:11;30:18; 36:3 suggesting (3) 30:2;34:10;64:4 suggests (3) 13:15.24:72:17 summary (2) 19:4,5 super (1) 75:15 supervision (1) 44:5 supplanted (1) 58:9 support (3) 15:11,14;25:18 suppose (1)

Lewis G. Sheffield, Ph.D. March 14, 2014

36:9 supposed (1) 61:29 sure (25) 4:12;8:8,12;11:6; 15:8;18:22,24;19:27; 20:25,25;22:2,12; 26:13:28:5:32:27: 41:26;45:25;55:17,21; 62:7:65:22:75:28:76:9, 10;78:4 surface (3) 7:1.1:73:27 surfaces (5) 12:23,29;13:5,7,9 susceptible (2) 38:22,22 suspect (1) 29:23 switching (1) 66:9 sworn (1) 3:18 symphysis (3) 7:14;46:13,13 synthase (1) 72:16 synthesize (1) 74:11 system (15) 6:4;7:7;13:7;36:11, 17:37:11.11.16.21.24: 47:21:48:12:58:22; 71:30:72:12 systems (2) 18:12:37:30 Т

table (31) 9:7,8,27,28;41:24,27, 29:42:1.9.26:43:20: 48:11,14,21;49:10,13; 55:22,25;57:10;59:5, 30;60:17;61:4;62:20; 63:12,13,15,15;64:27; 66:28;67:27 tables (1) 60:4 tail (3) 33:24;57:17;77:17 tails (2) 34:30;35:2 talk (6) 20:15;42:3,4;43:22; 60:11;68:26 talked (2) 4:3;68:23 talking (12) 10:7;23:20,21;32:8; 49:11;56:25,27;59:19; 62:9,10,12;64:21 talks (1)

24:23 teach (2) 4:8:41:3 teacher (1) 15:22 teaching (4) 40:22,26;41:1,4 Technical (2) 4:9;29:29 technically (4) 18:15;23:10;29:5; 71:18 technicians (6) 43:27,29;44:4,8,19, 20 technique (5) 17:11;27:25;45:28; 64:18,22 techniques (4) 43:15;45:17;58:3; 68:14 technology (7) 28:29;29:6,9,13,23, 25;71:21 tedious (1) 57:29 telephone (1) 4:5 telling (1) 21:11 template (1) 7:14 tenured (1) 40:19 term (3) 6:12;30:20;46:22 terminology (2) 65:27;73:15 terms (8) 5:13;11:21:37:25; 43:7,16;61:24,30; 69:15 terrible (1) 45:22 test (13) 20:10;22:25,28,30; 23:7,8;30:26;33:30; 34:2;46:26;60:22; 66:29;68:3 tested (2) 22:24:34:12 testified (1) 3:19 testing (3) 20:9;23:21,22 tests (1) 27:2 tethered (1) 21:22 texts (2) 52:15,20 thinking (2) 60:5;69:25

third (3) 47:4:59:5:64:2 Thornton (36) 3:6.23:41:13.29: 42:24:45:19.21:49:9. 16,19;50:7,11,14,29; 54:4;56:25,29;57:1; 59:16:60:30:62:6.8.23; 63:13;64:20;67:14,18, 30;68:8,11;72:2;74:20; 76:25;78:4,9,12 Thornton's (1) 76:24 though (3) 18:8;34:28;73:22 thought (3) 18:15;32:9;72:4 three (7) 33:25;35:21;48:11; 64:28;66:2,13,24 **THRONTON (1)** 46:24 throughout (2) 77:9,15 times (8) 25:5;34:29;35:2; 65:2,8;66:2,14;70:17 timing (1) 27:5 tion (1)15:17 tired (1) 40:27 tissue (5) 12:22,25;13:6,7;27:3 tissues (1) 12:27 Tizard (1) 52:13 T-i-z-a-r-d (1) 52:13 today (3) 29:30;58:8;76:24 today's (2) 30:3;60:7 together (5) 17:4,5;63:25;64:7; 66:30 told (1) 62:23 took (4) 33:26;36:9;43:13; 53:21 tools (1) 43:15 top (12) 48:11;49:2;52:10,19; 54:9,13;63:4,8;68:1, 16;76:1;77:1 topic (1) 40:18 total (2) 59:2:69:19

town (1) 40:23 tract (3) 12:28.29:13:2 training (2) 5:8;43:7 transcribed (1) 74:10 transcript (3) 45:22;79:4,9 transcription (1) 72:23 transfer (1) 44:23 transferred (1) 73:20 transfers (2) 73:13,16 transformation (6) 7:13;44:24;45:15,27; 50:2;64:10 translation (1) 7:15 transport (1) 76:16 transporters (1) 76:19 transports (1) 73:2 treated (7) 11:20:15:29,30; 24:13.14:53:20.22 treating (1) 66:30 treatment (38) 10:1,2,2,29;11:9; 16:4,17,20,23,30;17:2, 4;22:25;23:14,16,20; 26:7,23;54:13;55:18, 23,24,25,26,29;59:6; 63:23,24,26,30;64:1,5, 13:66:8,18,19:77:3,5 treatments (5) 10:16;54:16;55:10; 64:29;67:1 trends (1) 65:12 trials (1) 52:28 tried (2) 33:2:72:6 trouble (1) 29:3 true (18) 19:13;26:1,2,3,3,4,5; 30:10,14;33:17;45:26, 29;47:2;49:26;58:10; 74:16;77:9;79:6 truly (2) 33:3:36:22 truth (1) 16:1 try (3)

Volume 1

12:7:45:19:65:24 trying (7) 5:29;15:20;22:11; 28:30;38:11,28;39:26 t-test (7) 26:9,9;28:3;61:2,4; 64:25;77:17 tube (1) 46:26 twice (2) 25:6;27:8 two (40) 10:16;11:25;12:12; 15:28.29:16:10.21: 17:15:20:15.30:24:17, 19;25:5;26:16,22; 28:11;33:26;34:23; 41:25;42:15;46:3;54:9; 58:1;60:4;63:16,17,21, 29,29;64:6,12;68:1,16; 69:6,9;70:17,17;73:8; 76:11:77:17 two-way (1) 65:25 **Type (24)** 15:19;16:12,14;25:6; 31:7;34:11,15,22,25; 35:11,19;38:30;39:2,2, 4,7,10,12,20;47:20,22; 53:1;58:22;66:1 types (5) 20:15;25:16;69:7; 73:28:75:17 typically (2) 14:17:53:1 U ultimately (1) 13:27 unchanged (1) 40:15 under (9) 3:19;11:9;23:9;24:1; 34:8;44:5;49:2;59:13; 63:3 undergo (2) 7:2;74:12 underlying (2) 29:11,22 underneath (2) 32:26:33:22 understand- (1) 63:10 Unequal (2) 45:13,14 unfamiliarity (1) 29:24 unfortunately (2) 9:14:77:25 unintentionally (1) 36:10 unique (1)

Lewis G. Sheffield, Ph.D. March 14, 2014

45:16 unit (2)8:7:48:7 units (10) 44:21:46:4.18:47:13. 15;48:1,3;49:30;50:26; 51:2 University (15) 4:16,21,23,30;5:6; 8:4,14:33:14:40:19: 56:15,18;57:4;61:22; 67:10,25 unlike (1) 31:13 unneeded (1) 74:26 unpublished (1) 17:26 unrelated (2) 60:1.2 up (11) 9:2;11:5;34:26;35:2; 38:19;42:11;46:28; 52:25;60:29;61:22; 74:23 upon (2) 40:5;70:24 upper (1) 67:19 urinary (1) 13:2 use (17) 6:12;8:11,12;14:21; 15:27;18:5;28:30;33:4; 39:5,14,23:45:4,12,13; 47:26,29;73:3 used (19) 7:13:10:19:12:29; 18:6:20:11:42:19: 43:14:44:17:45:1.17; 47:18,19;48:6;53:19; 55:25:65:9:68:14; 72:14;74:10 using (9) 25:9;26:9;29:12; 64:18,22,25;65:27; 72:20;75:21 usually (2) 57:18:69:3 Utilities (4) 19:7;61:17,20,24 utilized (1) 58:4 UW (2) 25:3,9 V vaccination (1)

vaccination (1) 36:12 **vaccine (5)** 36:13,14,23;37:20; 52:28

valid (1)	62:3	within (2)	0.015 (1)	
16:16	voltages (2)	34:5;70:5	59:21	2
validity (2)	5:28;21:29	without (4)	0.017 (1)	
15:5,8	volume (1)	31:19;38:15;53:27;	59:14	2 (35)
value (14)	23:17	67:1	0.085 (1)	9:8,27,28;11:3;
10:10,11;34:22,22;		witnesss (1)	54:22	16:14;23:13;39:2,4;
39:13;54:28;60:1,5,17;	W	3:17	0.450 (3)	41:24,27,29;42:9,26;
63:4;64:3,9;66:28;68:4		wondered (1)	55:10,19,28	43:20;44:7;48:11;
values (2) 10:7,8	Wait (1) 12:3	66:7	0.796 (1) 60:17	53:29;57:11,11,22,23;
variability (3)	warrant (1)	wondering (1) 50:8	01 (2)	58:6;59:5,30;60:17;
17:18;23:5,6	13:28	word (3)	32:9,13	61:4;62:13;64:27;
variable (7)	way (27)	32:24;45:12,14	015 (5)	66:28;68:28;69:1; 70:10 11:74:20:75:12
47:4;49:1,2,18;	5:30;6:22;7:9;14:25;	wording (1)	10:29,30;11:9;27:15,	70:10,11;74:29;75:13 2:00 (1)
50:19,24;58:15	15:19;22:5;23:2,3,5,6;	5:30	27	41:17
variables (13)	24:13,14;25:19,21;	words (2)	017 (2)	2:09 (1)
44:21;46:3;48:12,15;	30:4;35:30;37:3;50:16;	6:6;54:30	27:15,27	41:17
49:3;57:11;58:21,24;	51:21,23;55:29;57:14;	work (32)	05 (11)	20 (2)
68:22;71:1,8,13;76:26	61:21;63:9;69:25;72:1;	5:10,11,13,14,25;	10:5,18,19;28:1;	33:4;77:14
variance (1)	73:16	7:19,27;8:3,8,15,18,20;	32:10,16,22,24;34:22;	200 (1)
54:25	ways (8)	9:1,7,19;13:25;14:17;	39:14,15	74:14
variances (1)	5:23;23:4;29:30;	19:11;30:4;33:19,20;	1	2000 (1)
45:14	61:2,9;66:6,15;71:20	42:16;43:7,24;45:8;	1	58:10
V-a-r-i-a-n-c-e-s (1)	weakness (1)	52:1,14,27;53:1;58:10;	1 (53)	2007 (2)
45:14	37:3	61:26;66:19	1 (53)	56:16;57:5
variants (1)	week (2)	worked (1) 5:7	10:12;15:19;16:12;	2010 (1)
68:18 varies (1)	26:15;33:25	working (1)	20:30;28:10;31:7;32:8,	5:4
14:15	weeks (4) 20:30;26:16,23;	44:5	12;34:11,15,22,25; 35:11,19;38:30;39:2,7,	22 (6)
variety (2)	28:11	worry (2)	10,12,20;44:7;51:16,	9:29,30;41:30;62:22;
6:15;7:8	Welch (1)	77:21,23	17,18,24,27,30;52:4,9;	63:3;64:12
various (13)	4:24	worth (1)	53:6,8,12,29;54:8;55:3,	23 (1) 73:27
5:26;6:1,18;40:25,	welfare (1)	13:25	6;58:5;62:13;69:3,4,7,	24 (1)
28;42:4;44:21;48:15;	8:13	worthy (1)	19,30;70:4,5,7,9,10,16,	63:18
52:8;61:9;70:22;71:1;	weren't (2)	15:16	21,21;75:13;76:21	248 (1)
75:5	18:24;37:7	write (2)	10 (12)	9:25
vary (1)	what's (13)	21:3;78:7	32:14,15;39:9,11;	249 (31)
27:11	9:1;15:19;26:9;	WRITING (1)	51:5;76:27,28;77:1,2,	3:2;9:20,22;15:16;
vein (1)	27:24;32:22;37:23;	79:9	12,12,14	18:12;19:5,10;21:10;
33:24	50:18;54:17;55:27;	written (1)	110 (1)	22:24;27:13;41:23,26,
version (3)	60:26;69:9;75:3,7	62:29	33:4	30;42:1,10;49:11,11;
32:30;43:9,10	whenever (1)	wrong (9)	12 (10)	54:4,5;59:21,30;60:6,
vertebrae (1) 33:13	55:27 WHEDELIDON (1)	10:15;12:9;21:18; 34:18,23;39:1,4,15,19	11:20,20;17:1,2; 40:1;51:5;66:19,19;	11;62:20,24;63:1,3,15;
veterinary (2)	WHEREUPON (1) 3:12	54.10,25,55.1,4,15,15	67:1,1	64:12,22;65:9
52:12;53:1	whole (8)	Y	13 (1)	25 (1)
via (1)	23:23;35:12;38:16;	▲ 	28:9	11:3 250 (42)
33:23	46:27;48:7,17;56:19;	ye (1)	14 (1)	250 (42) 3:3;18:28;19:5,8,9,
vicinity (1)	75:20	44:26	73:26	14;20:7,28;21:10,25;
68:25	whose (1)	year (1)	18-28 (1)	22:24;24:6;41:23,26;
virus (1)	43:11	5:19	3:3	42:10;43:20;49:11,14,
6:24	wide (1)	years (2)	1980 (1)	17;54:7,17;57:10;59:5,
vitro (11)	7:8	67:11;73:19	4:17	29;60:11,12,18,25,28;
46:22,26,29;50:19,	widely (2)	7	1983 (1)	61:1,5,13;62:25;63:2,
22;51:2;53:7,9;57:12,	72:25;74:28	Z	4:20	14,15;64:14,24,25,27;
15;71:10	wider (1)	(2)	1986 (1)	65:13;66:28
vivo (4)	38:6 Wilthank (3)	zero (3)	4:29	251 (5)
46:22,24,25,27	Wiltbank (3) 19:29,30;44:3	10:12;55:3,8	1996 (1) 23:27	3:2;28:19;30:5,15;
volt (2) 33:4;39:11	19:29,30;44:3 Wisconsin (9)	zinc (1) 75:15	1a (1)	70:29
voltage (9)	4:30;5:6;8:4,15;	13.13	69:21	252 (1)
5:11,18,22;10:3;	33:14;40:19,23;67:10,	0	07.21	3:3 253 (3)
22:14;33:2;53:21,28;	25	v	-	253 (3) 3:2;56:13;67:6
,,,,,,,,,.				3.2,30.13;07:0

254 (4)	4:22	
3:3;67:7,8;71:9 28-20 (1) 3:2	9	
3 3 (11) 3:6;17:23;19:2;24:1, 4,22,23;25:12;48:21; 56:26;73:27 3:28 (1) 77:28 3:30 (3) 41:13;76:22;77:28 3:31 (1) 78:15 303 (1) 56:30 304 (2) 56:29,30 3-14-14 (1)	9 (9) 27:13;41:26,28;42:2; 43:20;57:10;61:4;78:2, 11 9:00 (2) 78:2,11 90s (1) 5:19 9-21 (1) 3:2 95 (2) 10:20,21 99 (1) 58:10	
79:5 360 (1) 10:28		
4 4 (3) 26:6;64:29,29 41 (1) 3:8 45 (1) 4:11 5		
5 (8) 10:22;34:15,16,17, 22,23;39:15,17 50-50 (1) 34:30 56-14 (1) 3:2		
6 6 (2) 26:11;51:12 60 (1) 28:11 67-8 (1) 3:3 679 (1) 64:4		
8 8 (3) 64:28;66:17;73:27 83 (1) 4:22 86 (1)		