In The Matter Of:

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

> Lewis G. Sheffield May 9, 2014 Volume 2

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

> Original File SHEFFIEL (1).TXT Min-U-Script® with Word Index

Star Blends, et al., V.	v orume .	2 Lewis G. Sherheid May 9, 2014
	Page 81 EMPEALEAU COUNTY 1	Page 83 EXAMINATIONS
 Paul Halderson and Case Lyn M, Halderson, Code No. V1/388 County Road T Galesville, Wisconsin 54630 and Arctic View Farms, LLC N1/388 County Road T Galesville, Wisconsin 54630, Plaintiffs, Vs. 	e No. 12-CV-74 3 bs: 30303 & 30201 4	By Mr. Lawrence: 84. By Mr. Carlson: 176. By Mr. Thornton: 182. * * * *
 8 Sfar Blends LLC 1919 Riley Rd. 9 Sparta, Wisconsin 54656 and 10 ABC Insurance Company, a fictitious company 11 and Northern States Power Company 12 d/b/a Xcel Energy Services Inc. 1414 W. Hamlin Avenue 13 Eau Claire, WI 54/02 Defendants. 	24 25	 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were duly had: * * * * MR. HASKINS: Today is Friday, May 9, 2014. The time is approximately 9:22 a.m. This is Volume II, Tape Number 1, of the continuing video deposition of Dr. Lewis G. Sheffield, taken by Defendant Northern States Power Company in the matter of Paul Halderson, et al, versus Star Blends LLC, et al, State of Wisconsin, Circuit Court, Trempealeau County, Case Number 12-CV-74. This deposition is being held at the Law Firm of Boardman and Clark, Madison, Wisconsin. My name is Mark C. Haskins, I'm the video technician of Haskins Media Services, Apple Valley, Minnesota 55124. Will counsel please note their appearances, after which the court reporter will swear in the witness. MR. LAWRENCE: The Plaintiffs appear by attorney Scott Lawrence. Also present is their consultant, Dr. Theresa Peterson. MR. THORNTON: Tim Thornton for NSP.
276 112-17 283 151-11 249 27 277 88-29 284 153-15 250 278 135-22 285 155-17 251 28 279 141-17 286 156-29 252 280 149-16 287 165-27 253	venue, P.O. Box 117, 17, 920-773-2811, eared representing the 3 quire, of the firm enter, Minneapolis, rnton@briggs.com, ISP/Xcel Energy. 6 of the firm of 2, 116 Ash Avenue NW, vblaw.com, Wadena, esenting Crow Wing pany. 11 L 16 L 17 USLY MARKED 164-14 24 138-18 25 157-19 26	Page 84 MR. LAWRENCE: Then, I think you ought to put the Minnesota case into the record also, please. MR. HASKINS: Sure. Again, this matter has also been noticed in the matter of Randall and Peggy Norman versus Crow Wing Cooperative Power and Light Company. Court File Number 11-CV-12-1670, in the State of Minnesota, County of Cass. I think that covers it then? MR. LAWRENCE: Sure. And the Plaintiffs in that case, at least for the time being, appear by Scott Lawrence, and also Charles Bird may appear by phone later this morning. MR. CARLSON: Paul Carlson representing Crow Wing Power. MR. HASKINS: Okay. LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, PhD, an expert witness in the above matter, after having been first duly sworn, testified under oath as follows: CONTINUING CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. LAWRENCE: Q Good morning, Dr. Sheffield. A Good morning. Q Good to see you again. I am going to, in a few moments anyway, continue asking you questions about exhibit 254, that long spreadsheet we've talked about the last time,

Star	r B	lends, et al.,			May 9, 2014
		Page 85			Page 87
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	remember. Well, I can sort of, I think, give a general gist of this. I had been part of an earlier study with Douglas Reinemann, in which we did a lot of functional measure- ments. And, I am sorry, I am not going to remember years from this, but there was a request for proposals through the College of Agriculture, I believe that came about from a line in the state budget. But this is, again, very old memories. I responded to that and this project was selected for that. And it was designed to be, in some respects, a follow-up to the previous Reinemann study looking at some broader ideas. So the funding basically came out of the Wisconsin state government? I believe that is correct. And if I understood what you just said correctly, you believe it came through the Department of Agriculture, is that right?	22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Q A Q	I'm not saying it was on the original, I'm just saying I don't recall that it looked exactly like that. But the data looks right. There may be a copy of that spreadsheet on that disk without the means and so forth, the last four rows also, I'm not sure. But that one does appear This does look like something I would have generated. Like I said, I don't recall that being on there, but I'm not saying it wasn't. It was like ten years ago that I
30	A	Well, it came through the - it was funneled to the UW	30		generated this.
		Page 86			Page 88
4 5 6 7 8	Q	Yes. I don't know about state departments that would be involved. I may have known that ten years ago, but I don't recall that. Sure. All right. And can you describe with any more specificity than that, than what you just did, what the object was in follow-up to the earlier study? Yes. Yes. The objective was to first develop some tools to assess gene expression in cattle. At that time, this technology was rather poorly developed, particularly in cattle, it was beginning to be developed in humans and model species, like mice. Our objective was to try to get as broad a spectrum as we could of things that might be relevant to immune function. And, of course, along the way, include some things that might be either general of some genes that might be part of the immune function, but part of bigger things as well. And as you might notice in here some things that we used as controls that you wouldn't expect to see in immune function cells, and then use this to determine whether exposure to very low voltages in dairy cattle affected any of these potential measures.	18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	 was the - well, the data can be opened in EXCEL, what seems to take a few steps to do that with software that's available these days. Can you describe for me what software you were using back then? I believe that was done in the program called Minitab. Can you spell that for John? M-i-n-i-t-a-b. All right. Go ahead. That is a fairly standard statistics program. It's commercially available, and reasonably widely used. And I take it from your earlier testimony, you do not recall asking the program to calculate the means or P values in this case, is that correct? Oh, I would have done that. Okay. I just don't recall putting them on this spreadsheet. I certainly would have asked the program to calculate means, standard errors and P values. What statistical test would you have used initially to do that on this particular data? The initial test would have been a t-test. We have two treatment groups, and so there would have been a - what's often called a Student's t-test done on each piece. Then, is there such a thing as a two sample t-test? That's what the Student's t-test is. That's what I would have done.

Sta	r B	lends, et al.,			May 9, 2014
		Page 89			Page 91
1	Q	That's the disk.	1	А	That's correct.
2	Q	MR. THORNTON: Oh, okay.	2	~	
3	Q	I'll just give you a moment to look at 277. I believe	3	X	interest of getting through this testimony today in less
4	X	this just reflects the basic statistical computation that	4		than three day's time, and in the interest of not driving
5		would be done to accomplish a two sample treatment and	5		Mr. Kirby too nuts with long words. I asked Dr. Chris
6		control t-test in these circumstances. Would you take a	6		Chase, who is a veterinarian and a professor at South
7		look at that and tell me if you agree?	7		Dakota State University, and a past president of the
8	Α	That looks like the t-test, yes.	8		American Association of Veterinary Immunologists, to look
9	Q	All right. So, in this particular case, given that we	9		at a copy of exhibit 254 and summarize his understanding
10	×	have ten treatment cows and ten control cows, I believe	10		of what those variables mean, where he could. I think
11		we'd be looking at a t-test with - or a pool t-test with	11		there's a couple where he couldn't come up with the
12		18 degrees of freedom, is that correct?	12		meaning, and I'm going to ask you about that. All right.
	Α	I think that's correct.	13		I also asked him to indicate his opinion on
		And so, assuming the mathematics to be correct as at the	14		whether or not a change in each variable is indicative of
15	-	bottom of exhibit 254, let's just talk about what those	15		an immune system specific effect, as he characterizes it,
16		numbers are. We will take the first variable, ACK2 as an	16		or, in other words, if there's a change in that variable,
17		example. The C mean would be what?	17		is that more likely than not indicative of a change in
18	А	That would be the mean of the control group. That is the	18		immune function as opposed to something else. And he has
19		cows that were not treated with voltage.	19		given his opinion on that.
20	_	Sure. And that's just a simple average	20		I want to ask you those questions, too.
21		That's just an arithmetic average in this case, yes.	21		And you may not agree with him on all of them, obviously.
	Q		22		But this is going to permit us to do this in shorthand.
	A	That would be the arithmetic average of the animals, the	23		MR. THORNTON: I object. Exhibit 275 is
24	0	treated animals, that is, exposed to the current.	24		hearsay, and is the work and opinion of an expert that
		And the Fold (T/C) is what?	25	Λ	was not timely identified in this litigation.
20 27	A	A common way of expressing gene expression is to look at how much it changed as a relative. So, basically, that	26 27	Q	With that in mind, Professor Sheffield, let's go back to ACK2, which we talked about a little bit in the last
28		is taking the T Mean divided by the C Mean.	28		deposition. But in shorthand, would you agree with
	Q	And then the P value at the bottom is what?	29		Professor Chase's characterization of that variable on
		The last row is what is called a P value. And that is	30		exhibit 275?
		Dest 00			Dave 00
		Page 90			Page 92
1		taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the	1	A	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously
2		taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number,	2	A	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a
2 3	~	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it.	2 3	_	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment.
2 3 4	Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would	2 3 4	A Q	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the
2 3 4 5	Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in	2 3 4 5	_	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes,
2 3 4 5 6	Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go	2 3 4 5 6	Q	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells?
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q	Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q A	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A Q	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A Q	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect? I would have thought that neither result would have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A Q A	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect? I would have thought that neither result would have surprised me very much.
223345 6677889910011112213314415516617718	Q A Q A Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect? I would have thought that neither result would have surprised me very much. I'm contemplating asking you which of these variables you
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q A Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q A Q A	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect? I would have thought that neither result would have surprised me very much. I'm contemplating asking you which of these variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 18 19 20	Q A Q A Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct?	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	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect? I would have thought that neither result would have surprised me very much. I'm contemplating asking you which of these variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you should not have seen in the cells at all, because you
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q A	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct? Essentially, yes. Actually, let me correct that slightly.	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	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect? I would have thought that neither result would have surprised me very much. I'm contemplating asking you which of these variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you should not have seen in the cells at all, because you told me that was true of some of them. And I take it
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct? Essentially, yes. Actually, let me correct that slightly. Sure. Please do.	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	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect? I would have thought that neither result would have surprised me very much. I'm contemplating asking you which of these variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you should not have seen in the cells at all, because you told me that was true of some of those in this study,
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 177 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct? Essentially, yes. Actually, let me correct that slightly. Sure. Please do. What it actually shows you is how far away from zero your	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	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect? I would have thought that neither result would have surprised me very much. I'm contemplating asking you which of these variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you should not have seen in the cells at all, because you told me that was true of some of them. And I take it there probably are relatively few of those in this study, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 0 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 177 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q A Q A Q A Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct? Essentially, yes. Actually, let me correct that slightly. Sure. Please do. What it actually shows you is how far away from zero your effect of your treatment gets. And the smaller 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	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you should not have seen in the cells at all, because you told me that was true of some of them. And I take it there probably are relatively few of those in this study, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q A Q A Q A Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct? Essentially, yes. Actually, let me correct that slightly. Sure. Please do. What it actually shows you is how far away from zero your effect of your treatment gets. And the smaller the number, the further away from no treatment effect you	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	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect? I would have thought that neither result would have surprised me very much. I'm contemplating asking you which of these variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you should not have seen in the cells at all, because you told me that was true of some of them. And I take it there probably are relatively few of those in this study, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 177 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q A Q A Q A Q A	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct? Essentially, yes. Actually, let me correct that slightly. Sure. Please do. What it actually shows you is how far away from zero your effect of your treatment gets. And the smaller the number, the further away from no treatment effect you are.	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	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect on see an effect? I would have thought that neither result would have surprised me very much. I'm contemplating asking you which of these variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you should not have seen in the cells at all, because you told me that was true of some of them. And I take it there probably are relatively few of those in this study, is that correct? There are not many. Why don't we do that first then, and I won't have to ask you that about each individual one. Okay? First of all,
2 3 4 5 6 7 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 Q A Q	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct? Essentially, yes. Actually, let me correct that slightly. Sure. Please do. What it actually shows you is how far away from zero your effect of your treatment gets. And the smaller the number, the further away from no treatment effect you are. Then, I've also marked as an exhibit this morning,	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	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you should not have seen in the cells at all, because you told me that was true of some of them. And I take it there probably are relatively few of those in this study, is that correct? There are not many. Why don't we do that first then, and I won't have to ask you that about each individual one. Okay? First of all, those that you did not expect to see an effect on. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 177 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q A Q A Q A Q A	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct? Essentially, yes. Actually, let me correct that slightly. Sure. Please do. What it actually shows you is how far away from zero your effect of your treatment gets. And the smaller the number, the further away from no treatment effect you are. Then, I've also marked as an exhibit this morning, exhibit 275, and I believe you had at least 10 or maybe	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	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you should not have seen in the cells at all, because you told me that was true of some of them. And I take it there probably are relatively few of those in this study, is that correct? There are not many. Why don't we do that first then, and I won't have to ask you that about each individual one. Okay? First of all, those that you did not expect to see an effect on. If you want to just scan the list and tell us which ones
2 3 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 111 122 133 144 155 166 177 188 199 200 211 222 233 244 255 266 277 28	Q A Q A Q A Q A	taken from the t-test, as described here, comparing the treatment and control mean. And the smaller the number, the higher the level of significance we put on it. So, mechanically, to arrive at the P value, one would take the data, compute the means, compute the T value in accordance with exhibit 277 in front of you, and then go to either tables, or there are many online calculators that will do this for you these days also, and the tables or the calculator will give you the P value from the T number, correct? Essentially. Most standard statistics programs, including Minitab, will compute that. I don't know the algorithm it uses, but that's correct. Back in the days before software did this for us, we probably looked it up in a table at the back of the book that had many pages in it. That is how I learned to do it many years ago. And essentially, the P value shows you how far out you are on the bell shape curve away from the mean, correct? Essentially, yes. Actually, let me correct that slightly. Sure. Please do. What it actually shows you is how far away from zero your effect of your treatment gets. And the smaller the number, the further away from no treatment effect you are. Then, I've also marked as an exhibit this morning,	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 A Q A Q	 Yes, I'll say that's a - in all of these cases, obviously there's far more one could say about it, but that's a fair assessment. All right. And if you agree with his comment in the immune system specific effect column that he says, yes, and in particular, it has an effect on mast cells? Yes, it does. You told me in the first portion of your deposition that there were variables in this study that you did not expect to see an effect on. Would this be one of them or not? This one you might see an effect on or might not. It depends on what effect you have. Well, certainly wasn't one of the variables you put in here where you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you did not expect to see an effect on and which variables you should not have seen in the cells at all, because you told me that was true of some of them. And I take it there probably are relatively few of those in this study, is that correct? There are not many. Why don't we do that first then, and I won't have to ask you that about each individual one. Okay? First of all, those that you did not expect to see an effect on. If

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

29

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 95 Page 93 1 O Please. MR. THORNTON: You say what? 1 Because I think this is an important thing. Let's Leptin. Α 2 А assume, if the voltage exposure was having some 3 0 What page are you on? Bottom, near the last on Page 6. The various measurable effect on the immune function, would you 4 А expect to see these changed? So, I'm not - when I say 5 collagenases, mmp1, 3 and 9, I think would be unlikely. expect, I'm not trying to imply that I expected voltage 6 I wouldn't say it's impossible, but it's, I would say to either have or not have an effect. It's if it had an 7 unlikely. PLC and PLCa, although I would expect activity effect, would this be something that it might have 8 of those to go up, I'm not sure I would expect the affected? Is that clear and fair? 9 expression level to change. Q I think so. Mr. Thornton, any problems with that? 10 MR. THORNTON: Can you try it again? 11 several genes, PKACAlpha 1, PKACAlpha, PKACDelta, A I'll try it. Okay. When you say expect, there's two 12 PKCalpha, PKG1beta, RASGAP, RhoGDI. GDK is an aspects. Am I expecting that voltage has an effect, or 13 interesting one. Classically, we don't think of this as am I expecting that if something has an effect, would it 14 even being present in things other than in the illo affect that measurement? So, whatever we use as our 15 cells. So, at first glance, you don't expect to treatment, if it affected immune function, would this be 16 something you might expect it to see changing. As 17 opposed to a different question, which is, did I expect 18 out there are a few studies that have shown TEK to be going in, because I try to approach things scientific-19 ally as I don't know what the answer is before, in terms 20 of whether my treatment was having an effect. It's a 21 different aspect. Am I expecting the treatment effect or basil levels. 22 23 Q am I expecting this measurement to reflect any possible treatment effect? like, from the spreadsheet. 24 25 O 25 A I don't remember that. I would have to look at the So, perhaps stated another way, if we find the relatively few variables where you did not expect to see an effect, 26 spreadsheet to see. that's another way of saying there's simply not - those 0 Ŝure. 27 variables aren't at play with the change in immune 28 Ā But I'll take your word for that for now. function. Would that be fair? 29 Q Okay. So that would be a question mark, perhaps? 30 A I think that's fair. 30 A That was one I - there's not that much known about it in Page 94 Page 96 lymphocytes, but it's kind of - was unexpected to me to **1** Q Okay. Which ones are those then? 1 Α Okay. The ones that I would expect not too see an 2 even find any substantial amounts of it. effect? 3 So, I guess it's neither a yes or a no, but it's Q Correct. Before you even start. 4 Q 4 interesting? Α Adenyl cyclase. ATP Synthase. The CaATPase; calcium 5 Α It's interesting, and that's how I would describe that. ATPase. Casein Kinase. ClevagePolyA. I guess I was 6 On Page 11, Casein we wouldn't expect to see at all. unsure about CREP1 and CREP2. GAP. The column labeled 7 That's only present in mammary tissue. The Klebella, Glu TransV, which is Roman numeral 5. Stands for Glucose 8 Transporter 5. 9 Q I'm sorry. Let me see if I can find that one. 10 MR. THORNTON: Bottom of page 2. 11 different in the lymphocyto RNA genes, if you carry out, Q Or 254, would that be the one on the far right column or 12 has a Roman I, not V. 13 Α Oh, yes. That is an error on exhibit 275. That should 14 0 Sure. And I'm sorry, plus I take it would be one you be Glu Trans IV, not V. So, the spreadsheet here is 15 shouldn't even see it - -Glucose Transporter 5. On this - get my numbers right -16 Α Shouldn't even see it. You'd be watching an empty well, exhibit 275, it is typed as GluTransV. That actually 17 should be an IV in there. 18 And on 254 it says GluTransI, I think there should be a 19 is present in certain bacteria, not in the geriots (ph). Q V. 20 That's Glucose Transporter 4. That is the most common of 21 as what's called a housekeeping gene. It's something Α the Glucose Transporter proteins in those. 22 that you rarely see changing. So that would be one of these variables? 0 23 And then the Empty, that is his assumption А Yes. And that's one I would not expect to change in this 24 situation. 25 for that. 26 O Okay. Please continue. 26 0 А Hexo Kin 1. Which stands for Hexokinase 1. I would be 27 like to just summarize then. The items that you should

- 27 28 unsure about IGF1Rb, insulin-like growth factor 1
- receptor beta form. And similarly IGR1R. I would be 29 29
- 30 unsure about Leptin.

I would say the same thing about the next

see very much of it, if any, in this. Although it turns involved in lymphocyte proliferation and activity. And we did see this gene in this study. We didn't see a change in it, but we did see it expressed at the above

- Sure. You came up with a P value of about .13, it looks
- - that is actually a gene from a bacterium, (negative batgerium), Klebella pneumonia. I don't remember exactly which gene, off the top of my head. It's one of the lymphocyto (ph) genes of the bacteria. And that is so
- you would expect to see a signal there. And we didn't.
- or very close to it. That's what we call a specificity control. Same thing with pGEM. This is a plasmin that And GAPDH is another one that is - is very commonly used

here that nothing was added to that well, that's correct

So, because you jumped around a little bit there, I would not have seen in the cells at all, I believe would be -28

- well, on exhibit 254, it would be on the last page, right
- and the end, I think, if I understood you correctly?

30

Star	B	lends, et al.,			May 9, 2014
		Page 97			Page 99
_	٨	-			-
	~	That's correct.	1		falls into the category of did not expect to change until
	Q	And they would include casein, Klebella, pGEM, and Empty, is that correct?	2		we get to casein, and we covered those last several a few
3	٨	That's correct.	3		moments ago.
					I think that's correct.
	Q	Did I miss any? Are there any others that you shouldn't have seen at all?	5		All right. I think we probably have them all then. I
6	Δ	I think that's correct.	6 7		would then like to go through, I think we will go through the ones that you didn't name as falling in that
		And then starting on, let's stick to 254 for a moment.	8		category, and I will ask you for each of those variables,
9	Q	You described PLC as being one that you did not expect to	9		whether you would agree with Dr. Chase's description of
10		see a change, at least in gene expression, is that	10		the variable, and his conclusion regarding whether that
11		correct?	11		variable is associated with an immune system specific
	Α	That's correct.	12		effect.
		And then the same comment, this is where you jumped	13		I think the first of those that we - well,
14	×	around a little bit, so I would just like to clarify it	14		go ahead.
15		for the record, if we may. The same would be true of	15		MR. THORNTON: I'm going to object again
16		PLCa, next to it, is that	16		based upon an opinion of an expert that hasn't been
	A	That's correct. PLCa is what we call an isoform. It has	17		identified in a timely fashion or hasn't produced a
18		essentially the same activity, but it's a slightly	18		report.
19		different sequence of the gene.	19	Q	We've talked about ACK2 already, I believe. I don't
20	Q	If my notes are correct, the next one going to the right	20		think we need to cover that again.
21		on 254 would be PKACAlpha. I'm not sure I got that right	21		The next one is cFos. Do you agree with
22		though.	22		Dr. Chase's characterization of that item, and whether or
23	A	PKA - I may have skipped over one. There's a column	23		not there is an immune system specific effect?
24		here, says, PKAbCat. That I wouldn't expect to change	24		MR. THORNTON: I don't want to continue to
25	~	either.	25		interrupt you, but can I have a continuing objection?
		And, again,	26	_	
		PKCAlpha, PKARIIb.	27		MR. THORNTON: All right. Go ahead.
	Q	I think the next one in that category was RASGap, GAD, is that correct?	28		I will agree with his assessment. I do not know exactly
29	Δ	Actually, I'm not sure - I don't think I would have	30		what is meant by immune system specific effect. There are two possibilities that come to my mind. I am
30	п	Actually, The not sure - I don't think I would have	30		are two possibilities that come to my mind. I am
		Page 98			Page 100
1		-	1		-
1		expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the	1		assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is
2		expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP.	1 2 3		assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something
2 3	Q	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct?	2		assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is
2 3 4	Q A	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP.	2 3		assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when
2 3 4 5	Q A Q	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no.	2 3 4 5	Q	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column.
2 3 4 5 6	Q A Q	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no.	2 3 4 5	Q A	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization.
2 3 4 5 6	Q A Q A	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category	2 3 4 5 6	Q A	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A Q	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q A Q	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A Q A Q A	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q A Q	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	QA	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	QAQAQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	QA	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	QAQAQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	QA	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	QAQAQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	QĂ	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early
2 34 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 8 9 10 12 13 14 15 16 17	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q	 assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected. I think you did say that before, at least I wrote it down	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very high. So, things that would affect the immune system
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected. I think you did say that before, at least I wrote it down anyway.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	QA	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very high. So, things that would affect the immune system might well affect cFos even though it is not an immune
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected. I think you did say that before, at least I wrote it down anyway. Is that there's a these abbreviations start	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	QA	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very high. So, things that would affect the immune system might well affect cFos even though it is not an immune specific event, which is why I put it in the category of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected. I think you did say that before, at least I wrote it down anyway. Is that there's a these abbreviations start looking very similar. The PKA stands for protein kinase	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	QA	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very high. So, things that would affect the immune system might well affect cFos even though it is not an immune specific event, which is why I put it in the category of maybe you would see an effect on it. I would say many of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected. I think you did say that before, at least I wrote it down anyway. Is that there's a these abbreviations start	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	QA	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very high. So, things that would affect the immune system might well affect cFos even though it is not an immune specific event, which is why I put it in the category of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected. I think you did say that before, at least I wrote it down anyway. Is that there's a these abbreviations start looking very similar. The PKA stands for protein kinase 8. And the C and R stands for catalytic or regulatory sub-unit, and then we have 1 and 2 alpha and beta for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	QA	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very high. So, things that would affect the immune system might well affect cFos even though it is not an immune specific event, which is why I put it in the category of maybe you would see an effect on it. I would say many of the effects on cFos are very transient, it goes up and it comes back down very quickly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected. I think you did say that before, at least I wrote it down anyway. Is that there's a these abbreviations start looking very similar. The PKA stands for protein kinase 8. And the C and R stands for catalytic or regulatory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	QA	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very high. So, things that would affect the immune system might well affect cFos even though it is not an immune specific event, which is why I put it in the category of maybe you would see an effect on it. I would say many of the effects on cFos are very transient, it goes up and it comes back down very quickly.
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	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected. I think you did say that before, at least I wrote it down anyway. Is that there's a these abbreviations start looking very similar. The PKA stands for protein kinase 8. And the C and R stands for catalytic or regulatory sub-unit, and then we have 1 and 2 alpha and beta for each of those. So, it's easy to let them run together for a while. But that is one I would not expect to see changing. I may have mentioned it earlier. I think	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	QA	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very high. So, things that would affect the immune system might well affect cFos even though it is not an immune specific event, which is why I put it in the category of maybe you would see an effect on it. I would say many of the effects on cFos are very transient, it goes up and it comes back down very quickly. The next one in the list is cJun. Same question for each one. Do you agree with Dr. Chase's description as set forth on exhibit 275 and his conclusion about immune
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected. I think you did say that before, at least I wrote it down anyway. Is that there's a these abbreviations start looking very similar. The PKA stands for protein kinase 8. And the C and R stands for catalytic or regulatory sub-unit, and then we have 1 and 2 alpha and beta for each of those. So, it's easy to let them run together for a while. But that is one I would not expect to see changing. I may have mentioned it earlier. I think that's correct.	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 29	QA	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very high. So, things that would affect the immune system might well affect cFos even though it is not an immune specific event, which is why I put it in the category of maybe you would see an effect on it. I would say many of the effects on cFos are very transient, it goes up and it comes back down very quickly. The next one in the list is cJun. Same question for each one. Do you agree with Dr. Chase's description as set forth on exhibit 275 and his conclusion about immune system specific effect?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	QAQAQ AQ AQ AQ AQ	expected PKG1Alpha, and PKG1Beta. And then we go to the RASGAP. That, also, you did not expect a change, correct? I didn't expect that to change. And the RhoGDI also, is that correct? I didn't expect to see it, no. The rest of the sheet going to the right on the third page of exhibit 254, none of those fall in the category of did not expect a change, correct? All of them fall into the category of, you may see a change. On the last page, just as the first one we covered at length, was interesting. After that, the first one I noted as you did not expect a change was PKCDelta, about halfway across the sheet. Did I miss any or did we miss any? There is another one in here called PKAR2Alpha. I may not have mentioned that one. But that is one I wouldn't have expected. I think you did say that before, at least I wrote it down anyway. Is that there's a these abbreviations start looking very similar. The PKA stands for protein kinase 8. And the C and R stands for catalytic or regulatory sub-unit, and then we have 1 and 2 alpha and beta for each of those. So, it's easy to let them run together for a while. But that is one I would not expect to see changing. I may have mentioned it earlier. I think	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 29	QA	assuming what he means here is that the effect it has is very specific to the immune system, it is not something you see throughout the body. That's what I assumed when I first saw that column. I think that's a fair characterization. Okay. I want to make sure that what I'm saying lines up with what everyone is. I think the question I'm answering is the question that is intended to be answered. There is another aspect, and cFos is a very good chain to describe this with. CFos and cJun and some of the others on here are very common genes of the body. Almost every cell in the body has cFos in it. It's normally expressed at a very low level, and certain activators of the cell change the expression level of cFos. For example, if you take a cell and add a growth promoting agent to it, one of the very early effects is that the expression level of cFos goes very high. So, things that would affect the immune system might well affect cFos even though it is not an immune specific event, which is why I put it in the category of maybe you would see an effect on it. I would say many of the effects on cFos are very transient, it goes up and it comes back down very quickly. The next one in the list is cJun. Same question for each one. Do you agree with Dr. Chase's description as set forth on exhibit 275 and his conclusion about immune

lends, et al.,	May 9, 2014
Page 101	Page 103
did about cFos. It's another of these genes that is activated by a lot of different things, and present in most cells in the body. For each one we come to, I'm just going to ask the same question so we don't make a lot of transcript here. The next one MR. CARLSON: To the extent that Mr. Thornton objects, I'm going to join in those objections rather than making similar objections. So, both cases, okay? MR. LAWRENCE: Understood. I don't have any concern about opinion objections. MR. CARLSON: All right. But to the extent he makes an objection, I don't want to waste time voicing the same objection because I'm here on a different case. MR. LAWRENCE: Understood. MR. CARLSON: Okay. The next one that was not a yes to, did not expect to see an effect, is CasKin1. At least that's the abbreviation on the spreadsheet. Yes. His assessment of this is correct. It's one you might see. Because this is a very general enzyme in cells, you might expect to see some increase, but not seeing an increase would also not be too surprising. You can skip CasKin2 and go to CD14. I will agree with his assessment of CD14. And he does assess that as to be something to the immune system, and you would agree with that? Yes, definitely. Same with CD23. Is that okay, if I just go down the list of these?	 1 Q Both KREB1 and 2? 2 A KREB1 and 2, yes. 3 Q Then I think the next item - the next variable is CuZnSOD. 5 A That's right. I will agree with his assessment of that. 6 Q And can you tell us what the next variable is, Desmogelin? 8 A Yes. 9 Q I think Dr. Chase couldn't make it out, so he doesn't have any restriction. 11 A As near as I can tell, that is a rather bad typographical error on there. I believe that that is a protein called Desmogelin. 14 Q Can you spell that for John? 15 A Yes. I expected to spell that. And I am a terrible speller, so I'm going to get it close. If I misspell it, please forgive me on that. 18 Q We will. 19 A It is spelled, D-e-s-m-o-g-e-l-i-n. I think that is correct. 21 Q Okay. What is that protein and what's its function? 22 A This is one that, at first glance, you would not expect to see at all, if you look at the classic definition of what it is and where it's found. Desmosomes, D-e-s-m-o-s-o-m-e-s, are what we call junctions. They are very common in epidemial cells and sometimes found in other cells as well. 28 They basically hold cells together. If you've got a sheet of cells, something has to hold them together. There are several things that do this, and
Page 102 Please. Same with CD23. Same with CD8. Same with CD3. These are all very common proteins on the immune system cells and they have major roles in the immune function. Cdk1? Cdk1, his assessment of it is correct. Cycline dependent kinase is expressed during what we call the cell cycle. That is, cells are proliferated - or stimulated to proliferate, so it is present in most cells. So we wouldn't expect it specific to the immune system, unlike the CD genes, but if cells are being stimulated to proliferate, you might see it increased. I think we can skip ClevPolyA, and go - well, we probably should cover CREB1 and CREB2, because you were unsure, shall we say, on those with respect to Yes. Correct. His description of what they do is, I will agree with. These are cyclic A and P. To put this in some context, is a very common substance we call a second Messenger. It has a wide variety of effects on activity of many enzymes and expression of many genes. And it's used as a second Messenger in many cells in the body, including some in the immune system. CREB1 is a protein that is activated by cycline A and P. So I actually would say it probably wouldn't see the expression change a lot, but there are some cases when you do see changes in CREB1, and the same thing with KREB2, expression levels. So that's why I said I was unsure about it. It is not something that's specific to the immune system. I would say a very, very	 Page 104 desmosomes are among them. So we see this very commonly in epithelial cells. I was surprised to find very much of it in these cells at all. It turns out, however, that there are some lymphocytes that do seem to express this, and it seems to be involved in their ability to invade tissues. Lymphocytes sometimes need to attach to tissues and epithelial tissues, the lining of the vascular system, and lead to vascular system. It's been studied in a few disease processes where this occurs. Q Well, at the time A At the time I was kind of surprised to even see it there. Q So, I take it this perhaps falls into one that you didn't expect to see an effect or A I would not have expected to see any effect of that. I actually would have expected to see very low levels of it. Q I take it from that, that if there were - if it were detected and if there were a change, you wouldn't consider that likely to be immune specific, is that correct? A That would have been my initial reaction to it. Q As you sit here today, would that have changed? A I would be maybe a little more qualified. There is not a lot known about it in the lymphocytes. It is not well studied, because it, as I said, it has been traditionally thought to be in epithelial tissues. That's where almost all the work on it has been done. Q And the knowledge of the expression of lymphocytes is
	Page 101 did about cFos. It's another of these genes that is activated by a lot of different things, and present in most cells in the body. For each one we come to, I'm just going to ask the same question so we don't make a lot of transcript here. The next one MR. CARLSON: To the extent that Mr. Thornton objects, I'm going to join in those objections rather than making similar objections. So, both cases, okay? MR. LAWRENCE: Understood. I don't have any concern about opinion objections. MR. CARLSON: All right. But to the extent he makes an objection, I don't want to waste time voicing the same objection because I'm here on a different case. MR. LAWRENCE: Understood. MR. CARLSON: Okay. The next one that was not a yes to, did not expect to see an effect, is CasKin1. At least that's the abbreviation on the spreadsheet. Yes. His assessment of this is correct. It's one you might see. Because this is a very general enzyme in cells, you might expect to see some increase, but not seeing an increase would also not be too surprising. You can skip CasKin2 and go to CD14. I will agree with his assessment of CD14. And he does assess that as to be something to the immune system, and you would agree with that? Yes, definitely. Same with CD23. Is that okay, if I just go down the list of these? Page 102 Please. Same with CD23. Same with CD8. Same with CD3. These are all very common proteins on the immune function. Cdk1? Cdk1, his assessment of it is correct. Cycline dependent kinase is expressed during what we call the cell cycle. That is, cells are proliferated - or stimulated to proliferate, so it is present in most cells. So we wouldn't expect i specific to the immune system, unlike the CD genes, but if cells are being stimulated to proliferate, you might see it increased. Think we can skip ClexPolyA, and go - well, we probably should cover CREB1 and CREB2, because you were unsure, shall we say, on those with respect to Yes. Correct. His description of what they do is, I will agree with. These are cyclic A and P. To p

		lends, et al., v. von	me	4	May 9, 2014
		Page 105			Page 107
-		-	-		
1	Δ	performed, I take it? I think there were a couple studies before this study was	1		MR. THORNTON: But it's Arabic 4 in the He has Arabic 4. You will see it written both ways. And
3	Π	performed. I may be mistaken on that, but I believe	3	Л	I will agree with what he says about that.
4		there were a couple that showed that it might be present	4	0	The next item on 254, is the first one on the lefthand
5		in lymphocytes.	5	×	side of exhibit 254, is GMCSF. Same question.
6	0	Well, I guess, obviously, in general, the human knowledge		Α	I will agree with what he says.
7	•	of gene expression in human or cattle cells is a subject	7		Next is HexoKinase1. Excuse me. I'm sorry. That's one
8		that is just exploding over the last decade or two, is	8		you did not agree with.
9		that correct?	9	A	1 U
	A	In the last ten years, it has exploded, yes. There's a	10		
11	0	lot we know now that was not known when this was done.		A	I will agree with his assessment of what it does.
12	Q	Would it be fair to say the same is true with respect to	12		Because this is a very common protein to see expressed during stragg gituations, you might see it expressed with
13 14		immunological function of humans and animals, such as cows?	13 14		during stress situations, you might see it expressed with inducing some kind of stress here. It would not be
	А	I would say that's true, yes.	15		specific to the immune system, that we can say almost
16		The next item on the spreadsheet, and I'm going from left	16		universal protein.
17	`	to right on exhibit 254, but I think you can do the same	17	Q	
18		thing on 275. The next one is FAS. Same question.	18		would have expected to see an effect on that one. So
	A	I will agree with his assessment here of what is FAS, as	19		same question with respect to what Dr. Chase has
20		well as FASLigand. This, possibly you could see some	20		summarized.
21		changes in FAS. I think changes in FASLigand, would be		A	His description I will agree with. This is the receptor
22 23		much more likely to see if you're seeing immune system effects.	22 23		for IGF1, insulin-like growth factor 1. It's very widely distributed. I was not sure if I would have seen
24	0	And, Dr. Chase in the immune specific - excuse me, immune	24		a response or not. If I had to choose a side, I would
25	×	system specific effect column, had a no for FAS and a yes	25		have said less likely than likely.
26		for FASLigand. Go ahead. I'm sorry. Sounds like you	26	Q	
27		are sort of in the same ballpark?	27	А	
	Α	I am. I am. FAS is a receptor. It's present on any	28		
29		cells. It induces cell death. So, you're going to see	29	~	
30		effects, very wide spread effects in distribution of FAS.	30	Q	And then we have IgG1HC. Same question.
		Page 106			Page 108
1		-	1	Δ	Page 108
1	0	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor.			Page 108 And I agree with what he says.
	Q	-	2	Q	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct?
2 3		FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's	2	Q	Page 108 And I agree with what he says.
2 3	A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune	2 3	Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response.
2 3 4 5 6	A Q	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct?	2 3 4 5 6	Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions
2 3 4 5 6 7	A Q A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Q A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q A Q	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q A Q	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q A Q	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A Q A Q A A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Q A Q A A Q	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Q A Q A A Q A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Q A Q A A Q	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right.	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 Q	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q A A Q A Q	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4.	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 Q A Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A Q A A Q A Q	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four.	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 Q A Q A Q	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q A A Q A Q	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four. MR. CARLSON: I think you might have said 4	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 A Q A Q	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes. We wanted to include as many of the immunoglobulins as we
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A Q A Q A A Q A Q	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four.	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 Q A Q A Q	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q A Q A A Q A Q A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four. MR. CARLSON: I think you might have said 4 before - you might have said 1 before, but it's actually 4. Whoever typed this just left the I out. It should be	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 Q A Q A Q	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes. We wanted to include as many of the immunoglobulins as we could. Circulating in blood, there are four major immunoglobulins. There's IgG1, IgG2, which are very similar, but slightly different. IgG immunoglobulin A,
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A Q A A Q A Q A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four. MR. CARLSON: I think you might have said 4 before - you might have said 1 before, but it's actually 4. Whoever typed this just left the I out. It should be Glucose Transporter 4.	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 Q A Q A Q	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes. We wanted to include as many of the immunoglobulins as we could. Circulating in blood, there are four major immunoglobulins. There's IgG1, IgG2, which are very similar, but slightly different. IgG immunoglobulin A, and immunoglobulin M, IgM, we didn't get a good probe for
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A Q A A Q A Q A A A Q A Q A A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four. MR. CARLSON: I think you might have said 4 before - you might have said 1 before, but it's actually 4. Whoever typed this just left the I out. It should be Glucose Transporter 4. MR. THORNTON: Roman IV.	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 Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes. We wanted to include as many of the immunoglobulins as we could. Circulating in blood, there are four major immunoglobulins. There's IgG1, IgG2, which are very similar, but slightly different. IgG immunoglobulin A, and immunoglobulin M, IgM, we didn't get a good probe for IgM, unfortunately.
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	A Q A Q A A Q A Q A A A A A A A A A A A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four. MR. CARLSON: I think you might have said 4 before - you might have said 1 before, but it's actually 4. Whoever typed this just left the I out. It should be Glucose Transporter 4. MR. THORNTON: Roman IV. Roman IV, 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 A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes. We wanted to include as many of the immunoglobulins as we could. Circulating in blood, there are four major immunoglobulins. There's IgG1, IgG2, which are very similar, but slightly different. IgG immunoglobulin A, and immunoglobulin M, IgM, we didn't get a good probe for IgM, unfortunately. T'm sorry, You say you did not get a good what?
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	A Q A Q A A Q A Q A A A A A A A A A A A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four. MR. CARLSON: I think you might have said 4 before - you might have said 1 before, but it's actually 4. Whoever typed this just left the I out. It should be Glucose Transporter 4. MR. THORNTON: Roman IV. Roman IV, yes. Assuming that we don't know that Dr. Chase had that in	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 Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes. We wanted to include as many of the immunoglobulins as we could. Circulating in blood, there are four major immunoglobulins. There's IgG1, IgG2, which are very similar, but slightly different. IgG immunoglobulin A, and immunoglobulin M, IgM, we didn't get a good probe for IgM, unfortunately. Tm sorry, You say you did not get a good what? Probe. Assay for IgM. Immunoglobulin AG, or not,
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	A Q A Q A A Q A Q A A A Q A Q A A A Q A Q A A A Q A Q A A A A Q A Q A A A A Q A A A A A Q A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four. MR. CARLSON: I think you might have said 4 before - you might have said 1 before, but it's actually 4. Whoever typed this just left the I out. It should be Glucose Transporter 4. MR. THORNTON: Roman IV. Roman IV, yes. Assuming that we don't know that Dr. Chase had that in mind, do you agree with his comments or 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 26 27	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes. We wanted to include as many of the immunoglobulins as we could. Circulating in blood, there are four major immunoglobulins. There's IgG1, IgG2, which are very similar, but slightly different. IgG immunoglobulin A, and immunoglobulin M, IgM, we didn't get a good probe for IgM, unfortunately. I'm sorry, You say you did not get a good what? Probe. Assay for IgM. Immunoglobulin AG, or not, Immunoglobulin G is the dominant immunoglobulin
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	A Q A Q A A Q A Q A A A A A A A A A A A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four. MR. CARLSON: I think you might have said 4 before - you might have said 1 before, but it's actually 4. Whoever typed this just left the I out. It should be Glucose Transporter 4. MR. THORNTON: Roman IV. Roman IV, yes. Assuming that we don't know that Dr. Chase had that in mind, do you agree with his comments or is What he actually says, Glucose Transporter IV in 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	Q A Q AQAQAQA Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes. We wanted to include as many of the immunoglobulins as we could. Circulating in blood, there are four major immunoglobulins. There's IgG1, IgG2, which are very similar, but slightly different. IgG immunoglobulin A, and immunoglobulin M, IgM, we didn't get a good probe for IgM, unfortunately. I'm sorry, You say you did not get a good what? Probe. Assay for IgM. Immunoglobulin AG, or not, Immunoglobulin G is the dominant immunoglobulin circulating in blood. The most common antibody in the
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	A Q A Q A A Q A Q A A A Q A Q A A A Q A Q A A A Q A Q A A A A Q A Q A A A A Q A A A A A Q A	FASLigand is the Ligand for that receptor. GAP is one you didn't expect to see change. So let's proceed to GlutPerox. Yes. Yes. I will agree with what he says about that. Again, a change in that item would be likely immune specific, correct? Yes. I'll agree to that. And then, going to the right, the next is GluTrans - it should be Roman numeral IV? It should be Roman numeral IV, not V. MR. THORNTON: It's Roman IV on 254, but it's Roman V on 275? Yes. It's actually Roman I on 254, but 254 is sort of IV, quantity 4. That's right. MR. THORNTON: No, it's 4. IV, four. MR. CARLSON: I think you might have said 4 before - you might have said 1 before, but it's actually 4. Whoever typed this just left the I out. It should be Glucose Transporter 4. MR. THORNTON: Roman IV. Roman IV, yes. Assuming that we don't know that Dr. Chase had that in mind, do you agree with his comments or is	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 AQAQAQA Q A	Page 108 And I agree with what he says. His response would likely be immune specific, correct? Yes. This is an immunoglobulin. Immunoglobulins are antibodies. So, yes, that would be a very important immune system response. I sometimes have been asking you follow-up questions about the righthand column on Dr. Chase's spreadsheet. I'll just assume the general question includes that also, okay? Okay. If you would also. Thank you. The next one is IgG2HC. Same question. Same answer. I agree with what he says. Then, IgJ. And I agree with what he says about that. Why did you choose that one in particular? The IgGJ? IgJ, yes. We wanted to include as many of the immunoglobulins as we could. Circulating in blood, there are four major immunoglobulins. There's IgG1, IgG2, which are very similar, but slightly different. IgG immunoglobulin A, and immunoglobulin M, IgM, we didn't get a good probe for IgM, unfortunately. I'm sorry, You say you did not get a good what? Probe. Assay for IgM. Immunoglobulin AG, or not, Immunoglobulin G is the dominant immunoglobulin

Star Blends, et al.,	May 9, 2014
Page 109	Page 111
1 mucosal immunity. It's actually secreted in mucosal	1 minus 5th would be .0000821, is that correct? Four zeros
2 tissue, such as the GI tract, the lining of the lungs and	2 and 8121?
3 the mammary duct. So, it is a very important antibody.	3 A Four zeros and 821, that's correct.
4 And this is a piece of that antibody, it's	4 Q Four zeros to the right of the decimal point. And that
5 sometimes called secretory piece, that is necessary for	5 is about - well, it's almost a hundred fold less than the
6 it to be secreted into those foods.	6 .05 usually considered as statistically significant,
7 Q So, what consequences would a decrease in IgJ following	7 correct?
8 treatment have for the immune function of a cow?	8 A I'm not sure you can do that kind of calculation with P
9 A There's a couple of things that could be going on here.	9 values, but it is much lower than your typical .05.
10 One is, if the animal is producing less immunoglobulin G,	10 Q And that's just mathematically.
11 then that could result in a lowered mucosal immune	11 A Yes. It is - it is - that would be considered a
12 response. As you imagine, the tissues I mentioned, the	12 significant response. You get no dispute on the
lining of your lungs is actually outside your body. Itis exposed, potentially exposed to all kinds of	significance of a P value that small.It's fairly extraordinary to see a P value that low in
15 pathogens, as is the lining of the GI tract, for	15 any experiment, is it not?
16 instance. And this mucosal immunity plays a key role in	16 A I don't know. Oftentimes in experiments, we're looking
17 that protection.	17 for things that haven't been discovered before, so we're
18 The limitation to this study is, we looked	18 often looking for things where the response is fairly
19 at what circulates in the blood, not what's in the	19 subtle.
20 mucosal secretions. It's also possible that, what's	20 Q But it's certainly one of the larger responses that you
21 happening is, the cells producing the IgA are leaving the	21 would see?
22 circulation, even though they are still there producing	22 A It's a highly significant statistical.
23 it at a different cycle. Does that make sense?	23 Q If you recall, did you or anyone also, to your knowledge, do any further statistical analysis related in particular
24 Q Well, I think it does. If a change in IgJ is found, what, if any, conclusions can be drawn about changes in	24 do any further statistical analysis related in particular25 to IgJ beyond what is summarized on the spreadsheet?
the immune function of the cow?	26 A Not to my knowledge.
27 A (No response).	27 Q Would that be of any of these variables on the
28 Q I think you kind of answered that, but I am just asking	28 spreadsheet, was any further statistical analysis done
29 you to expound a little more.	29 beyond what's on this spreadsheet, to your knowledge, by
30 A Yes. I think that I probably answered it in a rather	30 you or anyone else?
Page 110	Page 112
1 round about way. In this particular study, we are	1 A Not to my knowledge.
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's?
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study.
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of?
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of.
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct?
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct.
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain?
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? A Heavy chain, correct. Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276?
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? A Yes. 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? A Heavy chain, correct. Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? A His summary I will agree with.
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? A Yes. Q Somewhere, taking it out 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? A Heavy chain, correct. Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? A His summary I will agree with. Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? A Yes. Q Somewhere, taking it out A Yes, I think I'll agree with that. 	 1 A Not to my knowledge. 2 Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? 6 A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. 7 Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? 9 A Not that I'm aware of. 10 Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? 12 A That's correct. 13 Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? 15 A Heavy chain, correct. 16 Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? 18 A His summary I will agree with. 19 Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of 0.003211, correct?
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? A Yes. Q Somewhere, taking it out A Yes, I think I'll agree with that. Now, in that particular item, and according to the 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? A Heavy chain, correct. Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? A His summary I will agree with. Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of 0.003211, correct? A That looks correct.
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? A Yes. Q Somewhere, taking it out A Yes, I think I'll agree with that. Q Now, in that particular item, and according to the specifics or the run that summarizes the spreadsheet, the 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? A Heavy chain, correct. Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? A His summary I will agree with. Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of 0.003211, correct? A That looks correct. Q And with respect to the immunological function of the
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? A Yes. Q Somewhere, taking it out A Yes, I think I'll agree with that. Q Now, in that particular item, and according to the specifics or the run that summarizes the spreadsheet, the P value arising from the t-test was 8.21, if I understand 	 1 A Not to my knowledge. 2 Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do 5 the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? 6 A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. 7 Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? 9 A Not that I'm aware of. 10 Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? 12 A That's correct. 13 Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? 15 A Heavy chain, correct. 16 Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? 18 A His summary I will agree with. 19 Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of 0.003211, correct? 21 A That looks correct. 22 Q And with respect to the immunological function of the cow, what does that tell us, if anything?
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? A Yes. Q Somewhere, taking it out A Yes, I think I'll agree with that. Q Now, in that particular item, and according to the specifics or the run that summarizes the spreadsheet, the P value arising from the t-test was 8.21, if I understand the notation correctly, times ten to the minus fifth, is 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? A Heavy chain, correct. Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? A His summary I will agree with. Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of 0.003211, correct? A That looks correct. Q And with respect to the immunological function of the cow, what does that tell us, if anything? A The same thing the IgJ would. One actually would expect
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? A Yes. Q Somewhere, taking it out A Yes, I think I'll agree with that. Q Now, in that particular item, and according to the specifics or the run that summarizes the spreadsheet, the P value arising from the t-test was 8.21, if I understand the notation correctly, times ten to the minus fifth, is 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? A Heavy chain, correct. Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? A His summary I will agree with. Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of 0.003211, correct? A That looks correct. Q And with respect to the immunological function of the cow, what does that tell us, if anything? A The same thing the IgJ would. One actually would expect those to change more or less in parallel, although IgJ is
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? A Yes. Q Somewhere, taking it out A Yes, I think I'll agree with that. Q Now, in that particular item, and according to the specifics or the run that summarizes the spreadsheet, the P value arising from the t-test was 8.21, if I understand the notation correctly, times ten to the minus fifth, is that correct? A That's what this says. And I do recall that that was different. I didn't - I don't recall - didn't recall the 	 A Not to my knowledge. Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? A Not that I'm aware of. Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? A That's correct. Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? A Heavy chain, correct. Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? A His summary I will agree with. Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of 0.003211, correct? A That looks correct. Q And with respect to the immunological function of the cow, what does that tell us, if anything? A The same thing the IgJ would. One actually would expect
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Somewhere, taking it out 20 A Yes, I think I'll agree with that. 21 Q Now, in that particular item, and according to the specifics or the run that summarizes the spreadsheet, the P value arising from the t-test was 8.21, if I understand the notation correctly, times ten to the minus fifth, is that correct? 26 A That's what this says. And I do recall that that was different. I didn't - I don't recall - didn't recall the 	 1 A Not to my knowledge. 2 Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do 5 the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? 6 A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. 7 Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? 9 A Not that I'm aware of. 10 Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? 12 A That's correct. 13 Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? 15 A Heavy chain, correct. 16 Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? 18 A His summary I will agree with. 19 Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of 0.003211, correct? 21 A That looks correct. 22 Q And with respect to the immunological function of the cow, what does that tell us, if anything? 24 A The same thing the IgJ would. One actually would expect those to change more or less in parallel, although IgJ is involved in another antibody immunoglobulin M that it's a major part of the IgA molecule. So you might expect those to change in about the same way.
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? 8 A Yes. 19 Q Somewhere, taking it out 20 A Yes, I think I'll agree with that. 21 Q Now, in that particular item, and according to the specifics or the run that summarizes the spreadsheet, the P value arising from the t-test was 8.21, if I understand the notation correctly, times ten to the minus fifth, is that correct? 26 A That's what this says. And I do recall that that was different. I didn't - I don't recall - didn't recall the exact number. But I do recall that IgJ and IgA were both lower in the treatment groups. 	 1 A Not to my knowledge. 2 Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? 6 A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. 7 Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? 9 A Not that I'm aware of. 10 Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? 12 A That's correct. 13 Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? 15 A Heavy chain, correct. 16 Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? 18 A His summary I will agree with. 19 Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of 0.003211, correct? 21 A That looks correct. 22 Q And with respect to the immunological function of the cow, what does that tell us, if anything? 24 A The same thing the IgJ would. One actually would expect those to change more or less in parallel, although IgJ is involved in another antibody immunoglobulin M that it's a major part of the IgA molecule. So you might expect those to change in about the same way. 29 Q And again, the P value for IgAHC is less than .05,
 round about way. In this particular study, we are looking at expression of IgJ protein in cells that are circulating in the blood. That's where our cells came from. So you can make - there's two possibilities here, two major possibilities, anyway. One is that the IgJ production has actually gone down, which would impair immune function. The other is that the cells producing the IgJ gene - or IgJ unit, are not circulating. That would suggest they have been recruited to somewhere else, which would mean a change, but not necessarily an inhibition of the mucosal immunity. Q So, to summarize, I think what you just told me is that decrease in IgJ in the blood can indicate either an impairment of immune function if its overall production has gone down, or it could simply be indicating that there's an immune response going on in the animal somewhere? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Somewhere, taking it out 20 A Yes, I think I'll agree with that. 21 Q Now, in that particular item, and according to the specifics or the run that summarizes the spreadsheet, the P value arising from the t-test was 8.21, if I understand the notation correctly, times ten to the minus fifth, is that correct? 26 A That's what this says. And I do recall that that was different. I didn't - I don't recall - didn't recall the 	 1 A Not to my knowledge. 2 Q With respect to the results of this experiment, the one involved in Messenger RNA expressions we've been discussing, generally speaking, whose job was it to do 5 the statistical work? Was that yours or somebody else's? 6 A I did the statistical analysis on this particular study. 7 Q And I take it, nobody else did any further analysis of any kind that you're aware of? 9 A Not that I'm aware of. 10 Q Proceeding to the next variable is IgAHC, is that correct? 12 A That's correct. 13 Q And my rudimentary understanding is, HC means heavy chain? 15 A Heavy chain, correct. 16 Q Same question that we were going at some time ago about Dr. Chase's summary on exhibit 276? 18 A His summary I will agree with. 19 Q And again, there we have a P value based on the t-test of 0.003211, correct? 21 A That looks correct. 22 Q And with respect to the immunological function of the cow, what does that tell us, if anything? 24 A The same thing the IgJ would. One actually would expect those to change more or less in parallel, although IgJ is involved in another antibody immunoglobulin M that it's a major part of the IgA molecule. So you might expect those to change in about the same way.

014	i Dichus, ci ul.,			1/1ay 7, 2014	-
	Page 113			Page 115	
1	A Correct.	1			
2	Q Dr. Sheffield, Mr. Thornton discussed with you last time	2	А	I believe so.	
3	Bonferroni adjustments or computations and we talked	3	0	And .05 divided by 100 would be, I believe, 5 times 10 to	
4	about that generally a little bit, about the controversy	4	×	the minus 4, is that correct?	
	and statistics surrounding that sort of adjustment.		۸		
5				If I can do multiplication in my head, that's right.	
6	Did you, in the course of your analysis of		~	Well, .05 is 5 times 10 to the minus 2, correct?	
7	the statistics related to this study summarized on 254,		А		
8	consider making adjustments of that general nature, given	8	Q		
9	that you studied many variables?	9	-	Bonferroni adjustment for all approximately 100	
10	A I didn't do that. I do think it probably would be a	10		variables, the change in IgJ still appears as statistic-	
		11			
11	reasonable thing to do. But I did not do that.			ally significant after a fine Bonferroni in that manner,	
12	Q And this, I'm going to ask you this question and maybe	12		if one were to do that, is that correct?	
13	one that you can't answer on the fly very well, and if			That seems right at the moment, yes.	
14	so, then so be it. But given that there were quite a few	14	Q	I tell you what, we've been going for an hour and a half.	
15	variables here that you did not expect to change when the	15	-	I told Mr. Bird I'd call him and see if we can include	
16	experiment was designed, how would you apply that sort of	16		him at about this time. Shall we take a short morning	
17	adjustments to these circumstances? Could you, either	17		break? Perhaps you could use a break, doctor?	
18	generally or specifically, to the extent you can address	18	А	Sure.	
19	that?	19			
20	A That is one of the problems with the Bonferroni. If you	20		(At this time a recess was taken - 10:37 to 10:54.	
21	have maybe, let's just use as an example, ten	21			
22	measurements that you would expect to change and then ten	22	0	Dr. Sheffield, we'll get back to the spreadsheet in just	
			Q		
23	that you don't expect to change, but maybe they will	23		a moment, but Mr. Bird on the phone over the break	
24	change, do you do the Bonferroni correction based on the	24		reminded me to ask you, I believe that my office sent you	
25	ten or the 20? I can't answer how I would do that. I	25		a copy of the transcript of your first deposition in this	
26	would probably call a statistician I know and ask him how	26		matter after it was taken. Did you receive that?	
27	to do that.	27	А	I don't recall. I would have to look to see if I did. I	
28	Q If I understood the answer or series of answers you gave	28	••	might well have.	
			\mathbf{O}	I take it you haven't read the transprint then?	
29	Mr. Thornton the last time we were together, I take it			I take it you haven't read the transcript then?	
30	your experience is that if you call ten statisticians,	30	А	I think I would remember if I had actually read it.	
	Page 114			Page 116	-
	Page 114			Page 116	_
1		1	0	C C	-
1	you might get ten different answers, is that about right?		Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall	
2	you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see	2	Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that,	
2 3	you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what	2 3	Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change?	
2	you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like	2	Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too	
2 3	you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what	2 3	Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change?	
2 3 4	you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this.	2 3 4 5		Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad.	
2 3 4 5 6	you might get ten different answers, is that about right?A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this.Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less,	2 3 4 5 6	Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad.	
2 3 4 5 6 7	you might get ten different answers, is that about right?A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this.Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you might get ten different answers, is that about right?A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this.Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you might get ten different answers, is that about right?A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this.Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you might get ten different answers, is that about right?A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this.Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you might get ten different answers, is that about right?A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this.Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, 	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	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? 	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 A Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? 	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 A Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes. And do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary in exhibit 276	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? 	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 A Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? A If that is correct, that's what you would - let me - say that again. 	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 A Q A	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes. And do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary in exhibit 276 (sic) about the function of IL1a, or alpha?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? A If that is correct, that's what you would - let me - say that again. Q Sure. Could you read it back, John? I think I said it 	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	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes. And do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary in exhibit 276 (sic) about the function of IL1a, or alpha? MR. THORNTON: 275?	
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	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? A If that is correct, that's what you would - let me - say that again. Q Sure. Could you read it back, John? I think I said it right, and I don't think I can say it better. So, I'll 	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 Q Q	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes. And do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary in exhibit 276 (sic) about the function of IL1a, or alpha? MR. THORNTON: 275? 275. Excuse me. You're right.	
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	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? A If that is correct, that's what you would - let me - say that again. Q Sure. Could you read it back, John? I think I said it 	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 AQ AQ AA	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes. And do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary in exhibit 276 (sic) about the function of IL1a, or alpha? MR. THORNTON: 275? 275. Excuse me. You're right. 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 26 27 28	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? A If that is correct, that's what you would - let me - say that again. Q Sure. Could you read it back, John? I think I said it right, and I don't think I can say it better. So, I'll have him read it back. 	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	QA Q AQ AQ QAQ	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes. And do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary in exhibit 276 (sic) about the function of IL1a, or alpha? MR. THORNTON: 275? 275. Excuse me. You're right. Yes. And the next item is IL1b, or beta, correct?	
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	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? A If that is correct, that's what you would - let me - say that again. Q Sure. Could you read it back, John? I think I said it right, and I don't think I can say it better. So, I'll have him read it back. 	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	QA Q AQ AQ QAQA	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes. And do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary in exhibit 276 (sic) about the function of IL1a, or alpha? MR. THORNTON: 275? 275. Excuse me. You're right. Yes. And the next item is IL1b, or beta, correct?	
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	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? A If that is correct, that's what you would - let me - say that again. Q Sure. Could you read it back, John? I think I said it right, and I don't think I can say it better. So, I'll have him read it back. 	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	QA Q AQ AQ QAQA	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes. And do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary in exhibit 276 (sic) about the function of IL1a, or alpha? MR. THORNTON: 275? 275. Excuse me. You're right. Yes. And the next item is IL1b, or beta, correct?	
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 29	 you might get ten different answers, is that about right? A I don't know if I would go that far, but you will see discrepancies from time to time about things like, what is the best way to do adjustments for something like this. Q And given that there were, I think it's a little less, but approximately a hundred variables studied in this experiment, and let's assume it's a hundred, that's not quite right, but it's close, okay? If one were to do a very simple Bonferroni adjustment based on 100 variables, the procedure as I understand it is to reduce your P value for significance by dividing the number of variables into .05, is that correct? A It's something like that. I don't know if that's exactly right. I would have to look up the Bonferroni correction. But it's along those lines anyway. Q And with respect to a number like the one for IgJ, which is reported on the spreadsheet as 8.21 times 10 to the minus 5th, if you make that simplistic adjustment, based on 100, you would compare that to a P value for significance under these assumptions of .05 divided by 100, correct? A If that is correct, that's what you would - let me - say that again. Q Sure. Could you read it back, John? I think I said it right, and I don't think I can say it better. So, I'll have him read it back. 	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	QA Q AQ AQ QAQA	Sure. Well, even without having read it, can you recall anything today that you said the first time around that, upon reflection, you would like to correct or change? MR. THORNTON: I object. That's way too broad. It is broad. I would want to read it before giving a definitive answer to that. But off the top of my head, I'm not - you're asking me to recall something that was over a month ago, and it might be something - I'd have to read the transcript. You are correct on all of those accounts, but if there's anything that came to mind, I just wanted to know about it. Thank you. Going back to the spreadsheet, exhibit 254, and Dr. Chase's summary, exhibit 275, the next item on the list is IL1a, where I think it's frequently referred to as IL1Alpha, is that correct? Alpha is what it's usually called. And it's probably true of all the small subscript A's throughout the spreadsheet, is that correct? I think that's - at least most of them, yes. And do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary in exhibit 276 (sic) about the function of IL1a, or alpha? MR. THORNTON: 275? 275. Excuse me. You're right. Yes. And the next item is IL1b, or beta, correct?	

Paul Halderson, et al., v. Star Blends, et al.,	Volume 2	2 Lewis G. Sheffield May 9, 2014
	Page 117	Page 119
 between them, which is minimal, A They are different, but there's - th similar. 	ey're very, very 2 3	that correct?
 4 Q And in the case of IL1alpha and beta calculated and indicated on the spread case of alpha, 8.74 times 10 to the minus of beta, 2.55 times 10 to the minus of beta, 2.55 times 10 to the minus of beta, 2.55 times 10 to the minus of a That is what I'm reading here, yes 9 Q And which are even smaller than the I times 10 to the minus 5th, correct 11 A That is correct, yes. 12 Q So, if one were to perform a very sim adjustment to the P value, as we discu would still be statistically signific times 10 to the minus 4, correct? 16 A If that correction is the way it's dor correct, yes. 18 Q I'm not implying that one way or the were to do it that way, that would 20 A Yes. Correct. 21 Q All right. Then, the next item is IL1 me how that word is pronounced? 23 A It's an abbreviation for antagonist. 24 Q But pronounced 25 A Pronounced antagonist. 26 Q Do you agree with Dr. Chase's summ 27 A Yes. 28 Q The next item is IL2, is that correct. 30 Q And do you agree with Dr. Chase's summ 	Isheet, are, in the nus 6; in the case 5, is that correct?5gJ P value of 8.219?101111plistic Bonferroni ssed before, these ant if P equals 5141516ne, that would be still be true?1617201. Could you tell ant y relating to it?2122242527262727282929	 that's a fair summary. Q And by the measurements you made in the experiment, the fold for IL1 alpha and beta were around 1.65 for one, and 1.78 for the other, correct? A Correct. Q In other words, the serum levels of those cytokines went up in the treatment counts, correct? A That's correct. Yes. Q And in the case of IL10, the serum levels halved, essentially, is that correct? A That's about right. Yes. IL10 was lower. Q And I think you discussed with Mr. Thornton the last time that the immune responses seen in this study were smaller than you would typically see in an acute disease outbreak of some form in a cow? A Yes, you would see if an animal has an acute infection, you would see much bigger changes in IL1, for instance. Q And perhaps in some of the others? A And some of the others as well, yes. Q By the way, I don't think that TNFalpha was on your list
 it? A Yes. Q The P value there is also - well, it general ballpark as IL1alpha and II A Looks like these are a little out of re- to make sure I'm looking at the right correct. Q Specifically, it's 4.98 times 10 to the 9 A That's correct. Yes. Q The next item, could you tell us what you - just how you say the full name whether you agree with Dr. Chase A Yes, this is the IL2 receptor. And thought it was, and what he says at Q Moving on to the right, next is IL3. A And I agree. Q Next item is IL4. Same question. A And I agree. Q Next item is IL8. Same question. A And I agree. Q Next item is IL8. Same question. A Looks like IL8, yes. Q Oh, I'm sorry, did I say IL6? I'm looks like an accurate description Q Okay. Thank you. MR. THORNTON: You 	22's in the sameL1beta, correct?4egister, so I have5column. That's67minus 6, correct?89it is and whether10e, in other words,11?1214 that is what he13bout it is correct.14Same question.151617that.192021sorry.to imply that thatof IL8.26didn't say IL8.27	 A About a third of the way in. And MR. THORNTON: Page 11 on 275. Q Okay. Very good. A Yes, it is - it is on this. Q Then we will get to that. I'd forgotten. I'm sorry. Is there a concept in biology called cytokine induced symptoms behavior? A Probably. I'm not all that familiar with that specific term. MR. THORNTON: Objection. Foundation. Q And I take it you either haven't reviewed, or if you have, you don't recall much of the specifics of any literature about that subject? A I don't recall reviewing any literature on that - anything that was called that. MR. CARLSON: Let me just clarify. Are you referring to the cytokine storm as well? Is that the same thing, called it a cytokine storm? Q I guess I wouldn't choose to say they mean the same thing or not. I don't know. A I am familiar with the cytokine storm. But I haven't kept up with it very much, but I do know something of that. And I was assuming you meant something different with this.
29 Q The next item is IL10. Same que		Fr Burning initialinitation, you get a mequeinity get a massive

Star Blends, et al.,	May 9, 2014
Page 121	Page 123
 an infection, protective responses, but they can also damage normal tissue. And in many cases, it's the production of massive amounts of these inflammatory cytokines, they cause some of the deleterious effects during infection and inflammatory responses. Q All right. And if things are going well with the body, and with this massive cytokine release, one would hope that the inflammation serves its purpose and passes relatively quickly, is that correct? A That's what one would hope. Q Doesn't always happen that way though? A No, it doesn't. Q Are you familiar with any studies in any type of organism of the impact, if any, of a long-term elevation of cytokines at the levels of approximately two-fold or a little less than we're seeing in this study? In other words, I'm asking if there's been anything studied about There has been. Q Can you describe what you know about that, in general, please? A This is not an area I have reviewed recently. MR. THORNTON: Objection. Speculation. No foundation. Q Please continue. A So, I was familiar with this some years ago. I haven't looked at the most recent literature, except in 	 Q Can you spell that, please. A A-d-i-p-o-k-i-n-e. Or adipokine hypothesis, which is this idea that adipose tissue produces hormones, and that is considered a subset of that hypothesis. So, you could look for words like TNFAlpha and adipose tissue. Q Now back to IL10 for a moment. I think you've answered my basic question about that. The P value that is indicated in your summary is 2.93 times 10 to the minus 5th, correct? A Correct. Q And again, just grossly, if you were to make that very simplistic Bonferroni adjustment that we went through earlier, not saying it's right or wrong, that number is still less than 5 times 10 to the minus 4, and then this item would be - would still be considered statistically significant, even if one made such a Bonferroni adjust- ment, correct? A That looks right, yes. Q Next item on the spreadsheet is IL12Alpha, I believe, is that correct? A Correct. Q Next item is IL13. Same question. A I will agree with that. Q Next one is IL15. Same question. A Yes, I'll agree with that. Q Then, IL16. Same question. A And I'll agree with that.
Dogo 422	Dece 124
 Page 122 preparation for teaching, which is a little bit lower level than what one would do if I were going to be doing research on this area. Q Do you recall whoI'm sorry. Go ahead. A What I was going to refer to is, two points. Certain diseases, cardiovascular diseases, are felt to be caused by, or related to - maybe caused is not the right word - related to low level chronic inflammations. Some of these, not the interleukins, the TMFAlpha that you alluded to earlier, for example, is produced in adipose tissue. And this is actually where my familiarity years ago with this came from, that it's thought that some of the adverse effects of obesity on things like cardio- vascular health might be mediated by this long-term sub-acute inflammation, in other words, TMFI is usually implicated in that, in my understanding of that, rather than the interleukins, I don't know about the IL1 and its implication in that. Q All right. Do you recall who any of the folks who you would consider to be the leading researchers are or were in that area? A Not off the top of my head. If I were going to look at that again, it would be fairly easy to find it on health.ed. But I don't recall the names, off the top of my head. What would you search for on health-ed? What kind of key words? A Probably MR. THORNTON: Objection. Speculation. 	 Page 124 1 Q Next item is labeled INTb1. What's the full name of that item, and then do you agree with Dr. Chase or not? 3 A The full name is interferon, i-n-t-e-r-f-e-r-o-n, beta 1. 4 And I'll agree with what is said there. 5 Q The next item is Int2? Could you give us the full name and whether you agree with the summary on 275? 7 A That is interferon 2, and I will agree with that. 8 Q Next item, which is the lefthand column on page 3 of exhibit 254, could you pronounce the full name for us and answer the same basic question. 11 A The full name is lactose peroxidase. Do you want me to spell that? 13 THE REPORTER: I can look it up. 14 Q It's in the exhibit, so I think we're fine. 15 A And let me find it again. 16 MR. THORNTON: On Page 6. 17 A Yes. I'm just looking to make sure. He's asking me if I agree, and I wanted to make sure I know what I'm agreeing to. 20 Q Please. 21 A Yes, I'll agree with that. 22 Q Next item is Leptin. Same question. 23 A Yes, I'll agree with that. 24 Q Next item is mmp1, and is spelled out in full in exhibit 275, so the same basic question. 26 A Yes, I'll agree with that. 27 Q Next item is mmp3. Same question. 28 A I'll agree with that one. 29 Q And we have mmp9. Same question. 30 A And I'll agree with that.

Page 125 Page 127 **1** Q Next item is PLC. Same question. what is written beside the PGSH2, referring to COX-1, I 1 2 Α I'll agree with that. 2 will agree with, if we assume that that's referring to 3 Q The next item is PLCa, and in Dr. Chase's summary, he 3 the PGDSynthase, or COX-1. The PGSH2 is also called 4 says, "Not sure what this is." Can you expound on that 4 COX-2. Its roles are fairly similar to COX-1, it's 5 one in some length, please? 5 involved in synthases across the glandins, and it has an A PLCa stands for phospholipase C alpha. And it's one of 6 immune specific effect in inflammation. It does have 6 7 many forms of phospholipase C, which is an enzyme that is 7 some other roles, but its main role is mediating 8 involved in a wide variety of cell signaling pathways, in 8 inflammation. 9 many cells in the body, not specific to the immune 9 0 That's why I didn't ask, because I don't think it's 10 system. 10 clear. There is a comment there. 11 0 And so in terms of whether a change would probably relate 11 MR. THORNTON: The comment is sort of 12 to immunological function, that would be a no - it could, 12 screwed up. Usually, when you've got the wikipedia 13 but not likely? 13 reference, that's the end of the comment. But the 14 A It could, but it's the sort of enzyme that you might 14 comment for PCGDSynth appears to go down all the way to 15 expect activity to change more than expression. 15 pim1 1, and there's two wikipedia references. 16 0 Next item is PGDSynth, S-y-n-t-h, or Prostaglandin D 16 Α Without having the Web site here, I don't know what that 17 synthase, is that correct? 17 wikipedia reference says. Q Sure. And that's why I didn't ask the question. It is 18 Α That's correct. 18 19 Q Do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary there? 19 not clear what that is referred to, and Dr. Chase, 20 Α Yes. 20 obviously, was having trouble identifying what PGSH2 was, 21 Q Next item is labeled PGSH2, and Dr. Chase asks us to which is why he asked to double-check it with Dr. 21 22 double check with you as to just what this is. Could you 22 Sheffield. Okay. Yeah, I think you answered the pim1. 23 The next item is PKAbCAT. tell us, please? 23 24 A Okay. It stands for Prostaglandin synthase H2. It's an **24** A Okay. These next few that start with PKA are various 25 25 enzyme involved in Prostaglandin synthase, much like the sub-units and forms of an enzyme called protein kinase A, 26 PGD synthase is. These enzymes go by a wide variety of 26 and his description I will agree with on this. 27 Q I think on these, on all of these except maybe PKCalpha, names. An alternative name for this one is 27 28 Cyclooxgenase, or COX-2. 28 you indicated you really didn't expect to see a change in 29 Q Is that the item we had - is that one of those items that 29 any of those, is that right? 30 30 A I wouldn't have expected changes. one of the drugs for humans that was inhibiting that was Page 126 Page 128 pulled off the market a while back? **1** Q Would that include PKCalpha? 1 2 A Exactly. 2 Α That is a rather different enzyme. And that is another Q All right. Thank you. At least I got that right. And one that one doesn't always see changes in expression 3 3 4 is this an item, a change in which you would expect 4 level, but often sees changes in activity level. 5 ordinarily to relate to immunological function? 5 Q And by expression level, you mean the expression that 6 Yes. It's involved in inflammation. would show up in MRNA? Α 6 7 0 And it's pretty specific to inflammation? 7 Correct. Correct. Α 8 Α There are other places and times when it does occur, but 8 0 Okay. After the PKs, the various PKs, the next item is 9 it is not exclusively, but it is very often associated 9 PRASG. Again, that's one you didn't expect a change, 10 with inflammation. 10 correct? 11 Next item is pim1, and the same basic question about Dr. 11 А Correct. Q Chase's comments on 275. The same with the next one, RhoGDI, correct? 12 12 0 A I would agree with those assessments. 13 13 А Yes. 14 MR. THORNTON: Excuse me. You didn't ask 14 0 Then we have a series of five or six STATS, is that 15 him specifically whether he agreed or disagreed with 15 correct? 16 Chase's assumptions on PGSH2. 16 А That's correct. 0 And, generally speaking, maybe it's fair to ask these 17 Α He didn't make any assumptions on PGSH2 because he wasn't 17 sure what it was. together, maybe we need to take them one at a time, but I 18 18 MR. THORNTON: Well, but there's a 19 suspect you're going to agree with Dr. Chase that changes 19 20 description here. 20 in all of those would tend to be associated with immune 21 That is actually referring to the PGD, which is also 21 function, is that correct? А 22 called COX-1, is the way I interpreted that. I may be 22 A Let me just look through the list to make absolutely 23 misinterpreting it. 23 sure. 24 MR. THORNTON: I don't think so. Well. 24 0 Sure. 25 It's unclear. 25 А Yes. 26 0 Well, Dr. Chase makes no summary about COX-2, which is 26 0 Proceeding on to page 4 of exhibit 254, and which is near 27 what the PGSH2 is, or another name for it. 27 top of page 10 on exhibit 275, the next item is TEK, and I think I want to make sure this is clarified here. 28 А 28 I think you described that one as interesting before. 29 0 Please. 29 Α Yes. 30 A Or should. COX-1 is the same thing as PGDSynthase. So, **30** Q And I guess I'll ask you to respond to the standard

Page 129 Page 131 question, do you agree with Dr. Chase's summary? thinking. 1 1 Q 2 Α What he says is correct. I would add that the statement 2 Okay. Could you please tell me what your item is on 3 is expressed almost exclusively, and that is correct. 3 exhibit 254, please? 4 But he almost doesn't indicate that there are a few other 4 Α What I believe those are, are two very closely related 5 places it can get expressed. 5 proteins that are involved in cell death processes. I'm 6 0 Such as? 6 not sure if they are the same as Tia that he is stating 7 А There are some, as I discussed earlier, some, a few 7 here, but they are involved in what is called program 8 studies that suggest it might be expressed in leukocytes 8 cell death. Q And would a change in either of those tend to be some-9 that have roles in them. 9 10 Q Any particular type of leukocytes? 10 thing that would be immune system specific effect? 11 Α I'm not recalling that off the top of my head for that 11 A It would not be specific to the immune system. These are 12 one. I would have to look that up. 12 fairly - they're more often associated with the immune 13 0 And do you agree with Dr. Chase, that changes in PK would 13 system's, if I recall, distribution, but they are found 14 not be particularly immune specific? 14 in other places as well. But you would expect to - a 15 А No, they wouldn't. 15 change in them, in the immune system cells, might be seen Next item is TGFb1. Same question. 16 Q 16 in alterations of the immune function. They could be 17 А I agree with what he says about that. 17 seen in other things as well. 0 The next item is TIMP3. Same question. Standard 18 0 Next is TGFBP as it's shown on my spreadsheet, which is 18 19 different on 275. 19 question, I should say. Bottom of page 10 on 275. 20 MR. CARLSON: Looks like EB on the 20 A Yes, I'll agree with that. 21 spreadsheet. 0 Then we have TNFalpha or tumor necrosis factor alpha. 21 **22** Q I guess, let me ask you more broadly then, Dr. Sheffield. 22 Standard question. 23 Can you tell us what that is? Yes, and I'll agree with his assessment there. 23 A 24 A I believe that refers to a transforming growth factor 24 O Next item is TNFRec, tumor necrosis factor receptor, is 25 binding protein, not P2. Now, what he says, it is the 25 that correct? 26 same, TGFB2, that's the same function as B1, that is That's correct. 26 A Q 27 correct. But there is a trans - for many factors like 27 Same question. 28 this, there are proteins that are called binding proteins 28 A Yes, I'll agree with that. Next item is TPA. Same question. 29 that are secreted, bind to the growth factor, and 29 Q 30 modified its function. Sometimes they stimulate its 30 A I'll agree with that. Page 130 Page 132 function, sometimes they inhibit it. 1 Q Next item is Urokinase. Same question. 1 These are best known for insulin-like 2 2 Α I'll agree with that. 3 growth factors, but they exist for other things as well. 3 Q Then we have IL1Rec or interleukin 1 receptor. Same 4 And I am almost positive that this is referring to trans-4 auestion. 5 forming growth factor binding protein, not the B2 5 Α I'll agree with that. protein. 0 Then we have a series of variables that start with PK, I 6 6 7 0 Would a change in that item tend to be indicative of - -7 guess, I believe it's the next six. I'll ask you the 8 А That's a possibility. 8 same question for each. If you prefer to deal with them 9 Q Let me finish the question. Would such a change tend to 9 collectively, that's fine. reflect an immune system specific effect? 10 **10** A I would make one correction, and that is, the one that It's not specific. These things would be present in a says PKARI, Roman numeral I, alpha, that one is not an 11 A 11 lot of places in the body, just like TGFb1 would be. But isomer of PKC, it's an isomer to PKA. 12 12 it is important in the immune system. It's one of these I see. With respect to those six variables, do you agree 13 13 O 14 things that covers a lot of ground. TGFTransforming 14 that those that Dr. Chase has in the column on immune 15 growth factor proteins are involved in a huge variety of 15 system specific effect? 16 processes. They're involved in the immune system, but 16 Α Yes. These are the sorts of enzymes you find in most they're involved in things like limb pattern formation in 17 cells of the body in varying amounts. 17 18 embryonic development, to give you an example of how 18 0 Then we have INFalpha. What is the full name of that 19 involved their actions are. 19 item? 20 The next item is - well, let me ask you, tell me what the 20 А Interferon alpha. 21 spreadsheet says. It appears to be Tie1 or maybe Roman 1 21 Q And same question, the standard question. 22 or I, I'm not sure what it says, frankly. 22 А I'll agree with his statement. Q 23 Yes. This is Tie 1 and 2. 23 Then we have those last four items, which I think we have Α 24 0 All right. Dr. Chase does comment on those. Standard 24 already covered in detail when we got started? 25 question. 25 А Correct. 26 Α Let me look at his comment a little more carefully. 26 O I see, for example, with Casein, Dr. Chase says, "Good control," like that of some of those others. Okay. 27 MR. THORNTON: He's got a different - -27 A He has it listed as Tial. And I want to make sure if he MR. THORNTON: Before you leave that, could 28 28 is referring to the same thing that I am here. I'm not 29 29 you explain what Empty is?

sure he is referring to the same thing that I am

30

Star Blends, et al.,	May 9, 2014
Page 133	Page 135
 at all. So you'd expect - that's not background. You'd expect it to be close to zero. That's sort of a 'no signal at all' control. Q We still get a number, but they're much, much smaller? A Yeah. You will always - you will always get a - like if you're trying to detect for radiation, there's always a background radiation that you have to correct for, and that's what that means. Q All it means is, there's something in that well generating the light that the lab machine is detecting? R Right. Right. It's another of those controls for how specific things are. Q Oh, before I forget this one, you didn't review the transcript, but there's, I think two - approximately two occasions in the transcript of your first deposition, you were describing that machine detecting the light signals, and the area of the intensity and so forth, where Mr. Kirby got the word protons, and I think you meant to say or said - I think you said photons? A Yes. Q We will pass on that one. Oh, by the way, Dr. Chase got his PhD in veterinary science, veterinary medicine here at Madison in 1990. Do you recall knowing him at all? A I do not recall knowing him. I may know the person he studied with. But I don't recall that name. Q You never had any professional interaction with him, I take it? 	 numbers and that kind of thing which are in a lot of information. So, in doing so, I will certainly try to give you plenty of time to look at them. In fact, if you would like, I could stack them up and we can take a lunch break and you can take a look at them while we're on break and take them up afterwards, and I'll provide those to counsel, too. Does that sound reasonable? 8 A (No response). 9 Q It might go a little quicker than if I simply hand them to you and give you the opportunity to read them and spawn through them. But if you've got 12 A It's up to you. It depends how long they are and how many there are. Might be able to respond quickly or might need to look at them. 15 Q Well, let's give the first one a try. 16 A Why don't we try that. 17 Q Sure. About 8 or 9 of them, I think, total. Actually, I have one here and the others are back here. I think I'll try to do them in chronological order, that might be easier. The first one doesn't involve you, I don't think, but start with that. 22 Exhibit 278 is a series of documents that were produced by Professor Reinemann in response to the subpoena, and appears to be a memo from Steven LeMire to Doug Reinemann, dated June 28, '99, just a couple days before the first paper was sent to the Minnesota State Government. 28 Do you recall ever seeing this document before, particularly the cover sheet? 30 A I don't recall seeing it. I recall seeing the informa-
Page 134	Page 136
 1 A I don't recall any. I may have met him at a seminar or something at some point, but I don't remember. 3 Q Sure. For example, I happened to attend a seminar given by him most of the day in Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association in the fall of 2009 over - it was over farming methods and vaccinating dairy cows and that sort of thing. He did that commonly. Have you ever heard of one of those? 9 A I know that they're there, but I have never been to one. 10 Q In with the materials that were provided by the University back in 2008, and following in late 2007, there are a number of memos, either from you or to you, usually between yourself and Steven LeMire, the gentleman who is doing the statistics on that first study, about various alternative information and alternative statistical tests, and I'll get some of them out and talk about them here in a moment. But do you recall anything about your asking for alternative statistical analyses of the data from the first study, the one that was submitted to the Minnesota State Government, after the study was published in the year 1999? 22 A That was a long time ago. I don't recall anything specific. I think we did have some discussions about how to analyze the data. And I don't recall the time-frame of any of those, whether that was before or after various events occurred. 7 Q Well, I would like to show you some of those documents and talk to you about them a bit. I understand it was a long time ago, and they're not - fortunately, they're not lengthy documents, though some of them have tables and 	 tion that's in it, but I don't recall seeing the particular document. 3 Q On it are - there is a - obviously a portion of it is typewritten and then there's a whole bunch of hand written notations. Do you know whose handwriting is on that document? 7 A No, I do not. 8 Q And 9 A It does not appear to be mine, I can tell you that, but I have no idea whose it is. 11 Q As an example, Table 1 on the cover sheet, for the variable interleukin 1, micrograms per milliliter. We have a P value shown for serum of 0.071, the typewritten number, that is, over in the righthand column. Does that appear to be correct? 16 A That's what I see here, yes. 17 Q And up at the top of Table 1, it says, "Table 1. Blood file names and different responses in natural logs. Sample size is 12 per group." Did I read that correctly? 20 A Yes. 21 Q And we were talking about a blocked experimental design with multiple replicas the last time we got together? 23 A Yes. 24 Q Does it appear from this table that Mr. LeMire is analyzing the treatments and controls as the treatment group of 12 and control group of 12? 27 A I can't tell for certain from - just from this table. I don't see any indication on here of any blocked correction. 30 Q I guess we have to run the numbers to really know that,

Star Blends, et al.,	May 9, 2014
Page 137	Page 139
a is that compat?	dono in block compat?
1 is that correct?	1 done in block, correct?
2 A Or get a printout of where those numbers came from, the	2 A There Actually - it could be. There's another caveat in
3 program that was used to do it.	3 there, but I'm sure we will get to that in a bit.
4 Q It appears that the following pages, which were all	4 Q All right. Well, this is as good a time as any. What is
5 pretty much sequential in Professor Reinemann's materials	5 that caveat?
6 relate to the SAS, S-A-S, program that was used for	6 A Well, if I recall correctly, one of the analyses that
7 analysis. Is it possible that by examining those pages	7 were done was to use the initial values before treatment
8 we could tell?	8 was applied as a covariant, and do an analysis of
9 A Assuming those relate to this table, it appears that you	9 co-variants. That controls for a lot of the block to
11 Q Could you take a look and tell us whether you can tell	so it still might be appropriate to run a block, include
12 whether a block design is accounted for in this analysis	a block of that in that analysis.
13 or not?	13 Q Do you know if Steve LeMire did, in fact, do a covariant
14 A I do not see anything that would suggest it is. It looks	14 analysis on this data?
15 like it was not.	15 A I believe so.
16 Q And, for example, I'll refer to Bates number pages down	16 Q Again, not something you've ever run the numbers on?
17 in the lower righthand corner where it says Reinemann	17 A I haven't.
18 with a number, numbers in the 2600 plus range. For	18 Q Do you have any understanding one way or the other as to
20 iL1 serum, apparently, is that correct?	sent to Minnesota, which is exhibit 250 here, utilized a
21 A That's what that would mean.	covariant analysis? Feel free to look at this document,
22 Q And it appears that the input to the SAS program is 12	22 if it helps.
23 controls and 12 treatments, correct?	23 A That may help.
24 A Correct.	24 Q Sure.
25 Q And if this were a blocker, a replica analysis we would	25 A It appears it was not.
26 see something a little different, is that correct?	26 Q And you are referring in particular to the paragraph
27 A Not necessarily. Let me put where this is, what this is.	27 labeled Immune Function Responses at the bottom of page
28 This is simply a calculation - I believe this is simply a	28 8, just before Table 2?
29 calculation of the means, not the actual analysis, not an	29 A Yes. What it appears was done here in generating this
	table was to take the difference from base line level -
30 actual analysis of variance. If you've done an analysis	30 table was to take the difference from base fine level -
Page 138	Page 140
Page 138	
Page 138 1 of variance, it would look different than that.	1 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since
Page 138 I of variance, it would look different than that. I Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescring distribution<="" th=""></thdescring></thdescription<>	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve
Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test.	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and
Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some-	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the
Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did.	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between
Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between
Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed?	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes.
Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct.	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. 8 Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows
Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one
Page 138 1 of variance, it would look different than that. 2 So, let me look at the means. I believe 3 that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. 4 That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- 5 thing different if it did. 6 Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents 7 that a blocked analysis was performed? 8 A That's correct. 9 Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved 10 at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct?
Page 138 1 of variance, it would look different than that. 2 So, let me look at the means. I believe 3 that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. 4 That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- 5 thing different if it did. 6 Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents 7 that a blocked analysis was performed? 8 A That's correct. 9 Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved 10 at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this 11 first study, correct?	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct.
Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct?	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct?
Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appro-
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. D The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate.
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate.
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number that is on exhibit 278, correct? 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never had occasion to discuss with Steve LeMire or Douglas
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see something different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number that is on exhibit 278, correct? 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never had occasion to discuss with Steve LeMire or Douglas Reinemann, is that correct, in relation to this study?
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number that is on exhibit 278, correct? 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never had occasion to discuss with Steve LeMire or Douglas
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see something different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number that is on exhibit 278, correct? 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never had occasion to discuss with Steve LeMire or Douglas Reinemann, is that correct, in relation to this study?
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see something different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number that is on exhibit 278, correct? A Yes. Q Do you have any understanding of why an analysis of the experiment accounting for the three different blocks that 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never had occasion to discuss with Steve LeMire or Douglas Reinemann, is that correct, in relation to this study? A I don't recall those in any discussion like that.
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see something different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number that is on exhibit 278, correct? A Yes. Q Do you have any understanding of why an analysis of the experiment accounting for the three different blocks that was performed and was not done in this data? 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never had occasion to discuss with Steve LeMire or Douglas Reinemann, is that correct, in relation to this study? A I don't recall those in any discussion like that. Q It's about the lunch hour. I'm going to mark another
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number that is on exhibit 278, correct? A Yes. Q Do you have any understanding of why an analysis of the experiment accounting for the three different blocks that was performed and was not done in this data? A If you're referring to this table only (278), I don't. I 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never had occasion to discuss with Steve LeMire or Douglas Reinemann, is that correct, in relation to this study? A I don't recall those in any discussion like that. Q It's about the lunch hour. I'm going to mark another series of 8 or 9 memos, and you're welcome to have copies of them before lunch, including you, Professor Sheffield.
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number that is on exhibit 278, correct? A Yes. Q Do you have any understanding of why an analysis of the experiment accounting for the three different blocks that was performed and was not done in this data? A If you're referring to this table only (278), I don't. I don't know why Steve decided to run the initial analysis 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never had occasion to discuss with Steve LeMire or Douglas Reinemann, is that correct, in relation to this study? A I don't recall those in any discussion like that. Q It's about the lunch hour. I'm going to mark another series of 8 or 9 memos, and you're welcome to have copies of them before lunch, including you, Professor Sheffield. I'll ask you about those the first thing after lunch,
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number that is on exhibit 278, correct? A Yes. Q Do you have any understanding of why an analysis of the experiment accounting for the three different blocks that was performed and was not done in this data? A If you're referring to this table only (278), I don't. I don't know why Steve decided to run the initial analysis 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never had occasion to discuss with Steve LeMire or Douglas Reinemann, is that correct, in relation to this study? A I don't recall those in any discussion like that. Q It's about the lunch hour. I'm going to mark another series of 8 or 9 memos, and you're welcome to have copies of them before lunch, including you, Professor Sheffield. I'll ask you about those the first thing after lunch, okay?
 Page 138 of variance, it would look different than that. So, let me look at the means. I believe that is the printout. Yes, that is a simple P test. That does not have blocks in it and you would see some- thing different if it did. Q So, I take it, there's no indication in these documents that a blocked analysis was performed? A That's correct. Q And you told us the last time, that you were not involved at all in the statistical analysis of the data from this first study, correct? A Other than reviewing what was done and sometimes discussing what might be done next or in addition with Steve, I didn't do any of the actual computations. Q The number, the typewritten number for iL1 serum on exhibit 278 of .071, is, I believe, the same number that appears for the P value for iL1 serum in the final publication, which we marked as exhibit 250 the last time. We can check that. Exhibit 250, page 9, Table 2, shows a P value for iL1 serum of 0.071, the same number that is on exhibit 278, correct? A Yes. Q Do you have any understanding of why an analysis of the experiment accounting for the three different blocks that was performed and was not done in this data? A If you're referring to this table only (278), I don't. I don't know why Steve decided to run the initial analysis 	 yes, this is a - as I understand this analysis, and since I didn't do it, I could be mistaken, is that what Steve did was take the control group and look at it before and after change, and then do the same thing with the treatment group; and then look at the difference between those changes and do a t-test on the difference between those changes. Q And apparently the t-test was run on all 12 control cows and all 12 treatment cows as one control group and one treatment group, correct? A Correct. Q In these circumstances, would that be the most appropriate statistical test or would the block analysis be more appropriate? A I am not a statistician. In my opinion, as a non-statistician, this is not the best way to analyze these data, and some kind of analysis or variance which might include block effects would be more appropriate. Q And we discussed that a little bit the last time around, in general. And I take it, that's a subject you've never had occasion to discuss with Steve LeMire or Douglas Reinemann, is that correct, in relation to this study? A I don't recall those in any discussion like that. Q It's about the lunch hour. I'm going to mark another series of 8 or 9 memos, and you're welcome to have copies of them before lunch, including you, Professor Sheffield. I'll ask you about those the first thing after lunch,

- 30
- Metropolitan Court Reporters, Inc. (612) 333-7333

	lalderson, et al., v. Vol Blends, et al.,	ume	2	Lewis G. Sheffield May 9, 2014
				•
1 2 3 4 5 Q 6 7 8 9 10 A 11 Q 12 13 A 14 Q 12 13 A 14 Q 16 17 18 19 20 21 A 23 Q 24 A 25 A 26 27 28 20 21 22 A 23 24 25 20 21 22 22 24 25 27 22 22 24 25 27 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	Page 141 items. (At this time the noon recess was taken - 11:59 - 1:03). Just briefly, Dr. Sheffield, before I get back to those memos. In the first study, the one, the output of which went to Minnesota State Government, did the workers in the barn, who were with the cows daily, keep notes in that study, do you recall? I don't recall any. There are what appear to be some barn notes in the records. That could be. I just don't recall what they were or seeing them. We will get back to that, perhaps. The memos in front of us, we have covered, I believe , 278, which is the analysis with the handwriting. Exhibit 279, and I believe - excuse me. Exhibit 279 has a cover sheet upon which it says Analysis of Part III requested by Dr. Lewis Sheffield, 10/6 of '99. Did you have some opportunity to look at this over the lunch hour? Yes, I have. First of all, do you think that's accurate that you were requesting some further analysis? I probably did. I don't recall how detailed I would have requested it. Do you recall why you were requesting it? Yes. Basically, I had some questions about whether the	$1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ 25 \\ 26 \\ 27 \\ 28 \\ 27 \\ 28 \\ 26 \\ 27 \\ 28 \\ 27 \\ 28 \\ 28 \\ 27 \\ 28 \\ 28$	Q A Q A	Page 143 outs of how Proc Mix works. MR. THORNTON: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead, doctor. But the procedure, as I understand it, accounts for the correlation that could exist from one animal to another, - or not from one animal to another, but one sample to another within the same animal. How it does that, I don't know. So this was analyzed using Proc Mixed, and Proc GLM, taking into account the effects that individual cows have on the results. Are the results of that analysis tabulated anywhere within the document? Yes. In fact, most of the document is the results of that. For example, page 15 begins with The Models, is the title on it. The first variable analyzed here is called CHEM, which stands for chemiluminescence. The first analysis here is the mixed procedure, mixed model for chemiluminescence. The results of this of the SAS output is shown here. Now on page 16? Page 15, and continuing to page 16. At the top of page 16 you'll see a table that says, Tests of Fixed Effects. The mixed, in Proc Mixed, refers to what we call a mixed model. In statistics, we think of - often think of things as either being fixed effects or random effects. Fixed effects are things you decided on, is the easiest way to describe it, like which treatment you apply. We
28 A 29	Yes. Basically, I had some questions about whether the way it would have been analyzed in this initial 278,	28 29		way to describe it, like which treatment you apply. We decided the treatments.
30	whether that was the best way of analyzing the data.	30		Random are things that are selected at
	Page 142			Page 144
2 3 4 5 A 6 Q 7 8 9 A 10 11 Q 12 13	And there are a number of memos relating to further analysis of the data that followed that, which we have marked as exhibits. Have you had a chance to look at all of those exhibits? I glanced at them, and we can go through those. Okay. On the cover sheet of 279, in someone's handwriting, it appears to be written, "See iga serum." Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? I don't think it's mine. It doesn't look like mine. But someone did write that on there. Okay. All right. And tell me what it was you were requesting upon this occasion as reflected in 279, and what the conclusions are from the re-analysis, if any? Well, this analysis, these two methods of analyzing the data, one is called general linear models, which is a fairly standard analysis. The problem with the general linear models analysis is, it assumes that your observations are all independent of each other. Or how one should analyze data that, where that isn't true, for example, when you take one animal and measure it sequentially as a very long history in statistics, it's not all that simple to figure out how to correctly analyze that, because the methods that ignore the potential for correlated error terms, if the errors are correlated can give erroneous results. I don't recall the history of this, but the SAS, Statistical Analysis System, released sometime in the 1990s, and I don't recall when, a method called Proc. P-r-o-c, mixed. I, at the time, was not very familiar	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	A Q A Q A Q	freedom, type 2, which stands for type 2 sums of squares, and then the statistical test, which is Pr greater than F, that is the P value for treatment effect, day effect, and treatment by date interaction. So, in this case the treatment effect by this computation came in with a P value of 0.07? That's correct. Well, 0.087958. Oh. MR. THORNTON: It's zero point, not zero point zero. Correct. Zero point seven-nine-five-eight.

		laiderson, et al., v. voiu lends, et al.,	me	2	May 9, 2014
Ju		Page 145			Page 147
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 112 13 14 5 16 17 8 9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I'm not sure. DDF, degrees of freedom? NDF would be degrees of freedom. Yes, because there's one treatment, 5 day effects, 5 treatment by day. DDF, I'm not sure what that stands for. Okay. The third column is what? That is the sums of squares, from an analysis of errors. SAS uses something called a type 3 sums of squares. And the final column is the P value. Do you see a low P value in the day row? Day row. What's the significance, if any, of that? It fluctuates from day-to-day, and I don't know what the significance of that would be. Then I take it there are similar analyses for the other variables? Correct. It follows with the glm model for chemilumi- nescence, which is a different analysis. And as we follow through this, on 15, we have the beginning of the analysis of variance table on 16. And then on 17, that continues. About the middle of page 17, it appears to be expecting mean squares. Least square means for the two treatment variables. I'm looking through here to find a least squares means by date for these. Here's what I was looking for. At the top of page 17, we have the analysis, the variance table giving treatment, cow within treatment, effect, the effect of the individual cows, the day effect, and a treatment by day interaction.	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	QAQ A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Yes. Then, And then it repeats for all the other variance. Is there any one of these models, either the mixed model or glm model, that you consider most appropriate for these circumstances as set forth in these calculations? Most people today, I believe, would use the Proc Mixed procedure. And many of these results as expressed in the P value are different than what was reported in the original publication provided to Minnesota? Well, it is a different way of computing the P values, and that's not too surprising, but there were a couple that were Different by quite a bit? - were different by quite a bit. And the IgA in particular, is one. And it looks as if interleukin 1 is serum? Interleukin 1, I think 2, also. Let's see. Let's go through those results We will have to go through those. - a little bit? I think IgA was the first one of those where it looked very different. And that's, I believe those are the results that are found on about pages 36 and 37? 36, yes, page 36 and 37. Under the mixed model, for IgA, what's the P value? Under the mixed value, it says .0003.
30		And again, in the final column you have the P values for	30	Q	That's at the top of page 37?
1 2		Page 146 these. And again, the P value for treatment in this case is	2	Q	Page 148 Top of page 37, yes. As originally reported in exhibit 250, the P value under
3 4 5 6 7		0.7958, which I think is exactly the same as was noted in the prior table we spoke of a moment ago? Correct. If you notice, the treatment effect here, MR. THORNTON: Where are you. Top of page 17?	3 4 5 6 7	A	the two tailed independent test, 12 treatments and 12 controls that we spoke about earlier, was 0.796, is that correct? Yes. And that is an established
8 9 10 11		I'm on the top of page 17. We have a treatment effect, and there's a table here in which it shows that P value as .5066. Now this is something about statistics programs. When you do an analysis of variance, every-	8 9 10 11		That is very different. And when you look at the raw data, you begin to see why that is. I'm going to go - let me find it here. Beginning on page 11, we have a table of needs for control and treatment groups for each
12 13 14 15 16		thing you include in the model is a model effects. Everything that's left over is assumed to be your error. That's not always correct. That's where this expected means squares table comes in. What we really want to use is the error term, not the residuals	12 13 14 15 16		day. And if we come down on page 11, where it says, Observation, which is row 37 in this table, IgA serum, the 3 in the day means this is taken on day 3. 7 means day 7. Control and treatment. We see here the control and the treatment start off very different. And the same
17 18 19 20 21 22	Q	what's left over, but the cow within treatment effect. And how is that reflected in these tables? That is what this last line, which is a test of hypo- theses using the type 3 means square in this, means square, for cow (treatment) as an error term. So that is the row that has in the last column P value	17 18 19 20 21 22		on day 7. Now, if I recall correctly, day 3 and 7 no treatment had been applied yet. So, for reasons that I can't even guess, for whatever reason the serum IgA was different at the very start of the treatment. So, when we did a before and after study or analysis, as was done on this table in exhibit 250, it didn't show much effect.
23 24 25		you're looking for? Correct. That was included as a line within the commands given to the SAS Program to use that as the error term	23 24 25		This particular calculation could have all of the days in there, whether they're just looking at after the treatment had been done. And so it's including

	lalderson, et al., v. Volu lends, et al.,	ime 2	Lewis G. Sheffield May 9, 2014
Star D	Page 149		Page 151
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 10 11 12 13 14 A 15 0 17 18 A 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 Q 27 28	pages, I think I'm seeing them on 39 and 40? Yes. That's correct. And again, I think this is because of the differences in this. When you look - this particular analysis, basically, didn't recognize - the first two points in there were not actually points of where the treatment had been applied. And when you take that into account, you get that the effect is bigger than what it appeared in this analysis. So, would it be fair to say, in summary form with respect to exhibit 279, although the method of analysis you've tested it, that was attempted to be applied, might be more appropriate than the original paper, it wasn't applied correctly to this data set? I would say that's correct. So, then there are some more follow-up analyses that you requested, starting with exhibit exhibit 280 a couple weeks later, is that correct? I don't remember requesting 280, but that is a follow-up analysis, and in looking at that, I'm not entirely sure what that analysis was. It appears to be a multi- variable analysis of some sort. But there's not enough of it there for me to see what - it appears that it's being applied to IgA serum, but I don't see the actual SAS code for it, so I am not a hundred percent sure what was actually done with that.	6 7 A 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 14 A 15 16 17 18 19 Q 20 21	believe Steve actually did the randomization, probably using a computer program that is essentially a random number generated to assign the cows to treatment. I believe that's - I could be mistaken on that. Well, does it appear that the two groups of cows were reasonably similar? From the types of gross variables, like age of the cows, milk yield, lactation number, that they looked fairly similar. That's fairly typical of what you see with a well-randomized experiment. And then, exhibit 283 appears to be the result of another request for a different type of statistical analysis from yourself, is that correct? Actually, just a different variable. One of the things that we had recorded, and had not included in the initial analysis, was body temperature, morning temperature of the cow's body temperature. And that appears to be what's being analyzed here.
	Page 150		Page 152
5 6 Q 7 8 9 10 A 11 12 13 Q 14 A 15 16 17 18 19 Q 20 21 A 23 Q 24 25 A 27 Q 28 Q	analysis. For some reason, it looks like we don't actually have the numbers All I see is what looks like a cover page for a report that Steven has sent me. Then, 282 is a memo directed from Steve LeMire to Doug Reinemann. It indicates that you had requested the summary statistics that are on the second and third page. Do you recall requesting this information? I am pretty sure I would have requested that information. I don't recall the specific request, but it's certainly something I would have requested. And why is that? Well, these are just the basic characteristics of the cows that we were using in the study to just - to document what the animals were like, what their milk production was, how old they were, which lactation they were in, those kinds of things. And then, for each of those types of statistics or variables, there's a mean, a standard variation given in the table, correct? Correct.	2 Å 3 4 5 6 7 Q 8 Å 9 10 Q 11 12 13 Å 14 Q 15 Å 16 Q 17 18 19 Å 20 21 22 23 24 25 Q 26	Do you know whose handwriting it is on this page? I am not entirely sure. It looks a little like mine, at least in places. So, I may have written that. The split plot does not look like my handwriting. My handwriting is not that neat. But the scribble at the bottom does look like my handwriting. Up at the top it talks about Yes, the P, I'm pretty sure I wrote that P. That looks like the way I would write Ps, at least the first one. And on table 2 at the end of the typewritten introduction there, the third line, it says, "n equals 12 treated and 12 control cows," correct? Where? Top of the third page, third line. Top of the third page, third line. Top of the third page, third line. Yes, that's correct. Would that again indicate that this was run as a simple two tailed t-test and not with a block design or analysis? No. This was run, as I recall, as an analysis of co- variance design, where the initial values were included. I do not believe that a block was included in it. With that much of a block effect, it's included in the co-variant effect. Not always, but it is possible that much of it would be.

Star Blends, et al.,	May 9, 2014
Page 153	Page 155
 1 Q And as I think you indicated earlier, the original analysis in the published report, published in the sense that it went to the Minnesota government, the variable that was analyzed was the difference in cows from the first week test when no treatment was being applied to the later test, is that correct, with later assays, I should say? 8 A Yes. 9 Q And if one did that and one also took into account the block design of the experiment, that would yield an appropriate statistical analysis, would it not? That is, using the differences, the variable of interest in analyzing pursuant to replication of blocked statistics. 14 A It might. I would run that by a statistician. 15 Q Fair enough. 284. Another memo from Steve LeMire to Doug Reinemann, copy to yourself, indicating it was another analysis that you had requested, dated August 8, 2000, correct? 19 A That's what it says. 20 Q Do you recall requesting this one? 21 A No, I don't. I do know what it's about, so it's quite possible that I requested it, but I don't recall making the specific request for it. 24 Q Okay. And what is it about? 25 A A question came up. If this is the one I'm thinking it is, a question came up of a positive control. If we were to take cows and do something to them that we knew affected immune function, would we be able to detect it with the assays we were using? I do recall some discussions about that. What are we going to do? And 	 not know how it was analyzed at this particular study. Q I don't know that we have the data, the table with the data, but Table III on page 11 gives the results of the statistical analysis, I believe. Looks very similar to table 2, which has the electrical treatment. A Yes, I believe that is correct. The analysis here is a different analysis, a different way of analyzing it. But you're correct on that. Q Would this again be a t-test, basically? A This is a t-test, this Table III on page 11 is a t-test. Q And there's no issue with respect to the blocked or blocking issue because there's only one replicate? A Correct. Q And with a known immune depressant and dexamethasone for the 13 values reported were less than .05, correct? A That's correct. Q Okay. Then exhibit 285 appears to be another memo from Steve LeMire to Doug Reinemann, copy to you, about some more analysis you had requested, according to the document. Do you recall requesting this analysis? A This appears to be the analysis co-variants I was referring to. Q With respect to the positive control study? A Let me look at that. I don't think so. Must have been. There's not enough cows there. Q Under Introduction, it says, "It covers the positive control blood data"? A Okay. Yes. That's what that says. Q All right. In the course of all this analysis and re-analysis, did Steve LeMire, or anybody else associated
 Page 154 the decision was made. I don't remember who actually came up with this suggestion, but it was suggested that a classic immune suppressant treatment is high dose glucocorticoids. Q Doctor, the first two words were high dose? A High dose, yes. Q And that was, such a control test was run in the original Part III study using dexamethasone, is that correct? A That's correct. Q Go ahead. A Yes. It was actually after we had finished the results we had been discussing up to this point. We did a short study with a fairly small number of animals where we injected dexamethasone. I think it was a three or four days of treatment, probably says in here - yes, four days treatment, and made our various measurements on them. And this was just an analysis of those results to see if, in fact, we did effect immune function. Q Sure. And they were also analyzed in a different statistical manner in the original paper, correct? A Were they recorded in the original paper here or not? Q Page 11 on exhibit 250. We're looking at 250. I didn't recall those even being in this paper. Q Isn't that page 11 reports in exhibit 250? THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm not hearing you. A It says positive control. Let me read this. It makes the statement that they were suppressed, but I'm trying to find the table that actually shows the data. So I do 	 Page 156 with this experiment, that is, the Minnesota funded one resulting in the Part III paper, exhibit 250, ever do an analysis of the statistics of the difference between the after treatment and before treatment levels using a block design? A Not that I'm aware. Q Was that ever discussed among yourself and Mr. LeMire and Professor Reinemann or others associated with the experiment? A Not that I recall. Q So nobody ever expressed reluctance to do it that way, I take it? A Not that I recall. Q And it was Mr. LeMire who was primarily in charge of that part of the work, correct? A Correct. Q And the person overseeing - who is the person overall in charge of the whole experiment? Was that Professor Reinemann? A That would have been Professor Reinemann. Q Then, with respect to the second experiment involving the Messenger RNA, the gene expression, who would you describe as the person in overall charge of that experiment, if there was one? A That would have been me. Q In the materials from the University, there were - the one graph of that I found in those materials came out of Professor Reinemann's file. Maybe I can find that. (Exhibit 286). I printed off the sheets from Professor an einemann's disk right after that.

Page 159
sout to you that it was seen id a to see
sent to you that it was provided to us wer was, as marked on exhibit 276, and tk some of these if we need to later, tke to work through it before we do. ned "503 cow data sheets." And then, e. Array 503 layout. Array 503 ollated Array 503," as it appears on the by the University. have any idea what the 503 number we gave the file. ar spreadsheet, including the bottom ars in the file labeled "Array 503 so represent to you that Professor to is a retired statistics professor at innesota, with a long time appointment chool, has reread those numbers and ould just be a matter of HORNTON: I'm going to object to that. number one. Number 2, frank Martin tified as an expert in this case and expert disclosures in this case. ming up with that analysis is just a g the math, either by computer or t?
05 to .10 P values come from? Page 160
e those would have come from. They gs that I entered incorrectly in this nadvertently got my decimal point off I honestly don't recall. are referring to the table 1, which is bit ere are no P values in that table, is number, or a fold number anyway, is in ct? occasion to discuss the P values from n study, the second study that is, with mann? y such discussion. would like to ask you to assume, t the P values from this second study n exhibit 254, pursuant to a t-test as
I honestly a are referr bit ere are no number, or ct? occasion t n study, th mann? y such dis would lik t the P val

Star Blends, et al.,	May 9, 2014
Page 161	Page 163
 submitted for publication? A Well, it would certainly, when it refers to IL1 alpha and beta, would need to be modified from slightly to significantly, with a PS to .01, which is how very low P values are usually reported, and he did not reach significance would be struck. The significance of the IL2 and IL10 is not changed, just the P value changes. And the same thing with .04, the IgA, heavy chain, and secretory piece. Does that answer it? Q Sure. And again, as we have already discussed, an increase of interleukin 1, either alpha or beta, that is somewhat under two-fold, is certainly not indicative of a change associated with an acute infection, correct? A Correct. Q The main objective of a commercial dairy herd, certainly one of them, is to produce high levels of milk production and good components, correct? A Yes. That is a major objective. Q Do you have any opinion one way or the other as to what the likely consequence of chronically elevated interleukin 1 alpha and beta between 1.5 and two-fold, what would be there without electrical exposure, would have to the productivity of a commercial dairy herd? MR. THORNTON: Objection. Foundation. A I am not familiar with anything that would let me assess that reliably. Q Is it true, as I've heard some people express, that elevated interleukin 1 is one of the principal factors 	 more IgG in it than most other species do. Humans, for example, the major anti-body in milk is IgA. Cows have significant amounts of IgA in their milk, but they also have large amounts of IgG. But IgG is still an important part of immunity in these tissues that are exposed to the environment, such as the utter. If you think about it, the inside of the utter is outside the body. Q Explain that a little bit more, please. That last comment, I mean. 10 A Well, the mammary gland is lined with an epithelium. Milk is produced in small structures called alveoli and is transported through a system of ducts to the outside. So, it is just like the lining of your GI tract, it's actually outside the body. That means it is very easy for bacteria to enter through the teat, what we call the the streak canal, and infects the utter. And the utter
 Page 162 other infection? MR. THORNTON: Objection. Relevancy. A I've heard that. MR. THORNTON: Objection. Hearsay. Q Do you have any professional opinion as to whether or not its true or do you know? A I don't know. Q Do you know of any studies or publications indicating that one of the symptoms of chronically elevated inflammatory cytokines, such as interleukin 1, use some degree of inappetence? A Excuse me? Q Some degree of inappetence, not getting hungry? A I'm not aware of that. But I haven't read the literature on this in a while. Q I think you would probably agree that when dairy cows get some degree of inappetence, that's a big deal to a commercial dairy, fair statement? A Yes, feed intake is a big issue in dairy production. Q I have way too much paper here. What, if any, are the consequences of a decrease in IgA, either in serum or in tissue, it's fairly important. Circulating, I'm less certain about how important that would be. Q And why are IgA levels in the utter important to local 	 Dairy Science, in which you were a co-author at that time. Does this make any sense to you? A Possibly. I think there was a paper that we were drafting. I don't recall it ever being actually accepted for publication. I assume that is what he is referring to. Q I believe in 2003. Would that be approximately the likely A That would sound like about the right time-frame. I'm assuming that's the paper he's referring to. It was never published. Q Is that the same paper that was marked in your earlier
 26 immunity of the utter? 27 A Well, IgA in many mucosal tissues is the major anti-body that is secreted into a secretion. It turns out in cows, they are a little bit different in their mammary glands 	 26 expression ever put into a form that was intended to be 27 submitted for publication? 28 A No, they weren't.

Page 165 Page 167 all. I take it, unless they are in what you brought to 1 O Who was in charge of that? 1 2 the first deposition? I don't believe there's any - -2 А Dr. Reinemann did most of the setup, designing the stalls 3 I don't believe I do. 3 and working with the barn crew. I was responsible for Α 4 Q Back in the late '90s and the very early 2000s as this 4 handling the samples after - the blood samples that were 5 work was going on, did you know that Dr. Reinemann had 5 coming into the lab. been testifying for utilities in stray voltage litigation 6 0 There's a person named Misty, I believe the last name is 6 since approximately the early 1990s? 7 7 Davis, that appears in these forms. Are you familiar 8 I know now that he had been. I honestly can't remember 8 with her? Α 9 if I knew at that time if he had been or not. 9 А She was someone that worked with Dr. Reinemann. I don't 10 0 Not a subject that ever came up at the time? 10 know if she was a graduate student or post doctorate or 11 A I don't recall any discussions with him about it. I may 11 her exact status, but she was an employee with Dr. 12 have known it, but I may not. I just don't remember what 12 Reinemann in Ag. Engineer. 13 O 13 I knew when. Well, I tell you what, why don't we take a short break. **14** Q Other than responding to the subpoena here today and the 14 I'm close to done. And these gentlemen will want to ask 15 last time we got together, you have never been involved 15 you some follow-up questions, I'm sure, especially Mr. 16 in litigation - -16 Carlson, who wasn't here before. Why don't we take ten A I have never been involved in any such litigation. minutes, shall we say, or your pleasure. It's your 17 17 flight, so I'll make it shorter, if you want. 18 0 Sure. You've never been involved in any litigation as an 18 MR. THORNTON: That's fine. 19 expert witness, is that correct? 19 20 A No, I have not. 20 21 At least until whatever we've done here. I don't think (At this time a recess was taken - 2:15 - 2:26). 0 21 22 I'll bother going down to the car. I think we have 22 23 Q Dr. Sheffield, we've marked as exhibit 288 another packet covered it. 23 24 I've got copies of these, but may not be of barn notes, if you will, the water meter, et cetera, 24 25 very significant. Let me just ask you some questions 25 measurements on them and comments, and I believe these are from Replica 2, and were taken in January, 1999. 26 regarding them. 26 27 Exhibit 287 is what I understand to be some 27 Would you turn to the third page of those 28 notes taken by folks working in the first research 28 barn notes, Bates number 1663. Look through some of 29 project, the Part III paper project, taken off the 29 these quickly. I'm sorry. Actually, turn to the fourth page, if you would, 1669. There's a fairly long hand-30 materials provided by Dr. Reinemann in response to the 30 Page 166 Page 168 1 University subpoena. written description about cow number 3861 having a bad 1 Does that refresh your recollection at all 2 2 day there. Do you see that? as to whether there were any barn notes taken? 3 Yes. 3 Α 4 Α Well, that is what this appears to be. I don't recall 4 0 The initials at the bottom I think, appears to be RK. Do you know who that is? 5 seeing these specific notes before, but I knew that 5 6 things like water consumption and temperatures were being MR. THORNTON: Objection. Foundation. 6 7 recorded. I didn't see the raw records, but that's what 7 A watcher, and I think the last name was something like Α 8 this appears to be. 8 Kasper, if I recall. There was a Roger Kasper that was 9 MR. THORNTON: Object to that document. 9 involved in this, but I can't say for sure if that's who Foundation. 10 10 that's referring to. 11 Q The document, the Bates number from the University 11 O Roger was a one-time State Agriculture Department employee, I believe. Did you know that? 12 materials, the documents start with Reinemann 1595, for 12 the record, and runs through - well, there's a number of 13 13 А I seem to recall that, yes. 14 pages there. The last one of which is Reinemann 1611. 14 0 And toward the middle of the page, it's indicated by the And at the bottom of the sheet where the 15 15 author of this note, - I'll point to where I am on the 16 water and temperature and so forth are recorded, there's 16 sheet. "Decided to share concern with Doug and then a Comments section, is that correct? 17 Lewis." Do you see that? 17 MR. THORNTON: About half way. The line That's what it seems to be. 18 18 Α And what was the purpose, if you know, of having that that begins with "Jerry and - -19 0 19 20 Comments section on the form? 20 Α Yes. Okay. I see that. MR. THORNTON: Objection. Foundation. 21 Q Then, toward the bottom of the page, it's indicated, 21 22 A I would only be able to speculate, since I did not - -22 "Lewis, Doug and Josie felt okay to stay in trial." Do MR. THORNTON: Objection. Speculation. you see that? 23 23 24 0 Since you did not, what? 24 А Yes. 25 А Since I did not design the form or have any input into 25 Q And up on top, it describes her having trouble getting 26 26 up, struggling to get up and things of that nature. Do it. you see that? 27 O Well, were you not the person in charge of experimental 27 Yes. 28 design as it related to things having to do with the cows 28 Α themselves? Do you recall anything about that cow as you sit here 29 29 0

Min-U-Script®

30

today? Long time ago, I realize.

Page 169 Page 171 **1** A There was at least one instance. This may be this correct? 1 particular instance, where someone, and I don't remember 2 A It is indicated that she was treated with that. 2 3 who it was, possibly - probably Josie, since she worked 3 0 And if that were done, the only reason for that would be, with me, came and said, "We've got a cow that seems very 4 4 the thought process was, she was hypocalcemic? bad. Can we come look at her?" By the time I got there, 5 5 А That would be what you would use that for. 6 she did not seem to be having those problems. But that's 6 0 Now, according to the table in exhibit 282 that we went 7 really all I recall about that. 7 through earlier, I'll just show you my copy here, it 8 I do recall at least one instance where 8 indicates that that cow was, I believe 175 days in milk 9 there was a cow they were concerned about in the morning, 9 at the start of her participation in the study? 10 but by afternoon seemed to be doing okay. But I don't 10 A That's what that says, yes. 11 recall any more details about it. 11 Q Is it normal for a cow in mid-lactation, such as that, to Seems to be several pages into the document, about seven 12 be hypocalcemic? 12 () 13 pages in is a typewritten memo. 13 Α Not normally. That's usually something that occurs early MR. THORNTON: What's the Bates number? 14 in lactation. 14 Q The date on it is January 25, 1999. Q I believe the Part III paper indicates that there were no 15 15 MR. THORNTON: I'll just note the page in 16 16 noted differences between treatment and control cows in front of it is 1674, then we go to 1394. 17 17 behavior, or makes that indication at some length, is It is. Taken out of a different section of Dr. 18 Q 18 that correct? 19 Reinemann's materials. 19 Α I think it does. In there it talks of cow 3861 having 0 Would it have been a reasonable thing to evaluate 20 20 21 fallen, so forth. Do you see that? 21 statistically the number of cows, treatment and control, 22 A I see that. 22 through these three replicas that exhibited some unusual 23 behavior or some health problems, such as hypocalcemia? And further down is a duplicated, an e-mail from Roger 23 Q Kasper, to apparently Dr. Reinemann and others. 24 24 A Because the incidents of it is so low, I don't know how 25 you could make any conclusion from that. Are you among the recipients of that 25 26 e-mail? 26 Q Well, that would certainly be true for any one condition? 27 A I don't recall seeing this. I will look at the Cs on it 27 A Or any one condition, yes. 28 to see if I'm on there. I don't seem to be on the CCs to 28 Q How about, would it be reasonable to evaluate the 29 that. My e-mail address doesn't appear on this, and I 29 incidents of any unusual behavior for health problems in 30 don't recall seeing this. 30 the population of cows? Page 170 Page 172 **1** Q Sure. In the second paragraph below the addresses, **2** there's a line, indicates, "Doug, Lewis and Jerry A I'm assuming you mean by this, simply having a health 1 2 problem, yes or no. I don't know, just because that 3 discussed the situation, decided giving her a tube of 3 seemed like a fairly vague thing to do. Most researchers 4 Calcium Oral Gel would help boost her energy. Also some 4 would want to break it out into exactly which health problem you're talking about. 5 surface ointment was applied to the spot on rear hip 5 where the fur has rubbed off from rubbing against the 6 6 Understood. But the more you break it out, the more you 0 7 stall support." Do you see that? 7 run into the difficulty of small numbers of cows in - -Yes. 8 I see that. 8 Α Α 9 0 And if we go through these notes, we will find notes 9 0 - - experiments that are practical, right? 10 relating to cow 3861 on January 22, 23, 27, 28 and 29. I 10 A Yes. don't necessarily want to go through all of them with 0 11 11 In exhibit 286, the draft paper that was not published, 12 you, - -12 there's a reference in perhaps more than one place, but I appreciate. one of them is at the bottom of page 1, the very last 13 А 13 14 Q - - but just take a quick look and verify whether or not 14 line, and on the top of page 2, about epidemiological 15 there are multiple days with notations about that cow? 15 study of over 15,000 Swedish cows. Do you see that? 16 А Okay. 16 Yes. I remember reading this study. Α 0 Is there multiple entries about that cow? 0 And that had to do with herds that use or did not use 17 17 It does appear that way, yes. electric cow trainers? 18 А 18 On multiple occasions either down or having trouble That's correct. 19 0 19 А getting up, that sort of thing? 20 20 0 I'm going to show you what we have marked as exhibit 289, 21 There seems to have been some concern about her mobility. 21 which is out of an LC of your journal, titled Preventive Α 22 And from the treatment prescribed, it appears that the 22 Veterinary Medicine, and it appears to be a copy of an 0 23 consensus was that she was hypocalcemic? 23 article entitled, "Associations between use of electric 24 А I don't recall there ever being - I don't recall a 24 cow-trainers and clinical diseases, reproductive 25 discussion about that particular treatment. I mean, it's 25 performance and culling Swedish dairy cattle," and the 26 possible she was, but - let me. I would have to spend 26 lead author is Pascal A - not even attempt to pronounce 27 some time looking through where she was in lactation and 27 this, O-l-t-e-n-a-c-u. Is that correct? all of that. But I don't remember a discussion about That's correct. 28 28 Α 0 Does that appear to be the article that you were 29 treating her with calcium. 29 **30** Q But it is indicated in Roger Kasper's e-mail though, 30 referring to in your draft?

	lalderson, et al., v. Volu lends, et al.,	ime	2	Lewis G. Sheffield May 9, 2014
Star D	Page 173			Page 175
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 A 14 Q 15 16 17 A 14 Q 15 20 A 22 Q 23 A 24 Q 25 26 27 28 29	That does appear to be the article. Let me double-check this. Yes, that appears to be the same article. Then, on the fourth page of your paper, the page where the references start at the bottom. The draft paper says, starting on the fourth line, "An epidemiological study by Oltenacu - for want of a better pronunciation - et al, 1998, that found mastitis and reproductive problems were associated with the use of cow-trainers. This could suggest impacts of electrical exposure. But other explanations are also possible, including the herds with such problems may be more likely to use cow-trainers to solve them." Correct? That's what it says there, yes. And do you recall that at least one of the herds studied, a larger herd utilized one group of its cows and in the before and after use of cow-trainers Yes, that was in some of the data in there, yes. And even in that herd using the same cows as their own control, if you will, there was found to be an effect, is that correct? It has been a while since I've read this paper. Well, and I don't want to make you sit here and read it. I think I do recall that. Okay. Fair enough. We can all read the paper and find out. Have you had any occasion to read exhibit 252, which is marked from the last time, which is a group of materials prepared in connection with other litiga- tion, not this case, by Dr. Frank Martin, retired physics	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	A Q A Q A Q A Q A	I think you mentioned earlier that people had to share the University's equipment with other departments, it's not like it was available to you for as long as you wanted, I take it, is that correct? For some of it, that's true. By the way, did you ever talk to Mr. Thornton before the first leg of the deposition in this matter? Only to reschedule the deposition. Have you ever had occasion to discuss with anyone what you were going to be asked about in this deposition before it occurred, and I don't mean just today, but the first leg of it? No, other than to state your opinions on this work. But have you had occasion to discuss something with Mr. Thornton just as we took a break awhile ago? Did it have anything to do with this case or just pleasantries? Just the contents, you know, about, I think the comment that I made had to do with I can be kind of frustrating at times because I will answer a question by saying this, but on the other hand. In other words, lawyers like more defined answers than scientists often have? Yes, I think sometimes I could be frustrating because everyone seems to want me to give a yes or no answer, and I'm seeing nuances in things. I have enjoyed listening to your nuances, Professor Sheffield, but that's all I have at least for now. Counsel may have some follow-ups. MR. CARLSON: Do you have anything, Tim?
30	professor I have referred to?	30		MR. THORNTON: Go ahead. You haven't had a
	Page 174			Page 176
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 A 12 13 14 20 21 22 23 4 25 Q	collected from the cows in the second study, the gene expression study, which is referenced, I believe, in the middle of the second page of exhibit 286 or exhibit 251, whichever you prefer, and which indicates blood samples were collected via the tail vein immediately prior to applying current and at the end of a three week exposure period." And I think you told Mr. Thornton when we got together before that you didn't know where the data was from the initial blood draw? I don't think we ever analyzed those samples. I see. Is there a particular reason why or why not? Running out of time and money, and the analysis is quite difficult, tedious and expensive to perform. And then these gene expression assays are expensive and the use of sophisticated equipment, correct?	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A Q A	Correct. I just want to kind of go over a few things. I apologize in advance if I cover any ground that's already been covered, and I'll try not to. And I have read the transcript of the first portion of your deposition. Have you had any contact with attorneys Will Mahler or Charlie Bird or Jeremy Stevens, or anyone working on behalf of Randy and Peggy Norman? No. Is it your understanding that your testimony or March 14 and today will be to render opinions regarding your work?

Paul Halderson, et al., v.	Volume 2	Lewis G. Sheffield
Star Blends, et al.,		May 9, 2014
	Page 177	Page 179
1 Q My question is, did you lose any da	ta? 1 A	No. The IL interleukins are cytokines.
2 A Not that I know of.		Okay.
3 Q And when you testified just a few moment		The ones that start with Ig are immunoglobulins. Those
4 and money were running out and you had to		you might find standard values for. I couldn't point you
5 guess more wisely, you didn't analyze t	he initial blood 5	to a specific table, but there might be such.
6 tests?		Are you familiar with a method called, Repeated Measures
7 A The initial blood tests were not analy		Design?
8 that the data weren't collected and lo		THE REPORTER: Called what?
9 believe we ever analyzed those.	9 Q	1 0
10 Q And do you agree that it would be helpfu		
11 been helpful to have analyzed that in		
12 data so that you could compare it to what I		That's what the Proc Mix was, is a type of repeated
13 A I think more data is also better served.14 would have been better to have done		measures design. And you use Proc Mix for some of them?
15 Q And when I say what happened later, what	-	For some of the analysis, yes.
16 more artfully said, compare it to the e		And those are at least denoted in the exhibits, correct,
17 blood test results?		which ones have been used for?
18 A Yes.	17 18 A	
19 Q Are you aware of any authoritative refer	_	
20 establishes what are good or acceptable		
21 of levels for various substances found		
system, such as IL1, IL2, IL3, IL10, I		want to read to you something.
23 you've been calling it IgG, I have hea		Dr. Frank Martin has opined in the Randy
24 sometimes. Is there any such authorit		Norman case that he will testify that in the 1999 Science
table that you're aware of?		Advisors, Part III experiment, 1 milliamp current had an
26 A There are accepted values for what is nor		effect on behavior and health of the treated cows at a
27 those. I couldn't point you to a specific		highly statistically significant level. Do you agree
28 the top of my head. But for others, I d		with that statement?
29 are.		I'm not familiar with the behavior data that was
30 Q I take it, off the top of your head, you	ou can't tell me 30	collected on that, so I can't give an opinion whether I
	Page 178	Page 180
• which once that there are beginned by		agree on discorres with that
1 which ones that there are basically r 2 A Well,		agree or disagree with that. What about the effect of those levels on the health of
3 Q If I could finish. I take it that you're		the treated cows, did the 1 milliamp current have a
4 the top of your head, of which one of the		statistically significant effect on their health?
5 other - I'm calling them substances, I		statistically significant cricet on their neurin.
6 that's the best term, but better analyzed		Not that I know of. But again. I don't have the specific
		Not that I know of. But again, I don't have the specific data about health measures for that.
	in exhibit 254 6	data about health measures for that.
7 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275	in exhibit 254 6 . You couldn't, 7 Q	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors,
7 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275	in exhibit 254 6 . You couldn't, 7 Q there's known 8	data about health measures for that.
and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275off of the top of your head, say that	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known 9	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was
 7 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 8 off of the top of your head, say that 9 values for these that are acceptable? 10 A Well, those are different than protein 11 values are Messenger RNA values, and I the 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be 11 A	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be of what those 12	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250.
 7 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 8 off of the top of your head, say that 9 values for these that are acceptable? 10 A Well, those are different than protein 11 values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values 13 would be. 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be of what those 12 13 A	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250.
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be of what those ro-inflammatory 16 7 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 0	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes.
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sa 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be of what those ro-inflammatory y compounds, if in exhibit 254 7 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 0 15 14	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sat that's okay. I'm not in your field. B 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be of what those y compounds, if ut is there any 16	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sat that's okay. I'm not in your field. B table of known, accepted, you know, reasonable. 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be of what those y compounds, if ut is there any nable values for 17	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior.
 7 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 8 off of the top of your head, say that 9 values for these that are acceptable? 10 A Well, those are different than protein 11 values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values 13 would be. 14 Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sat that's okay. I'm not in your field. B 17 table of known, accepted, you know, reasoned those? 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be of what those y compounds, if ut is there any nable values for 18 Q	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement?
 7 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 8 off of the top of your head, say that 9 values for these that are acceptable? 10 A Well, those are different than protein 11 values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values 13 would be. 14 Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sa that's okay. I'm not in your field. B 17 table of known, accepted, you know, reason those? 19 A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be of what those y compounds, if ut is there any nable values for 17 18 Q 19 A	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement
 7 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 8 off of the top of your head, say that 9 values for these that are acceptable? 10 A Well, those are different than protein 11 values are Messenger RNA values, and I the 12 very difficult to find standard values 13 would be. 14 Q What about on the various cytokines, the p 15 and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sa 16 that's okay. I'm not in your field. B 17 table of known, accepted, you know, reason those? 19 A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. 20 Q And what I'm getting at is, I go to the 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be of what those y compounds, if ut is there any nable values for doctor and he	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement was based on. I am not aware of anything in that study
 7 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 8 off of the top of your head, say that 9 values for these that are acceptable? 10 A Well, those are different than protein 11 values are Messenger RNA values, and I the 12 very difficult to find standard values 13 would be. 14 Q What about on the various cytokines, the p 15 and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sa 16 that's okay. I'm not in your field. B 17 table of known, accepted, you know, reason those? 19 A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. 20 Q And what I'm getting at is, I go to the does a - runs a blood test on me. Gives m 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those of what those of what those y compounds, if ut is there any nable values for doctor and he ne back a report 1 6 1 7 1 8 2 1 9 1 0 1 1 1 A 1 4 2 1 5 1 6 1 1 1 A 1 6 1 7 1 7 1 8 2 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement was based on. I am not aware of anything in that study that showed behavioral differences, but I'm not aware of
 7 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 8 off of the top of your head, say that 9 values for these that are acceptable? 10 A Well, those are different than protein 11 values are Messenger RNA values, and I the 12 very difficult to find standard values 13 would be. 14 Q What about on the various cytokines, the p 15 and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sa 16 that's okay. I'm not in your field. B 17 table of known, accepted, you know, reason 18 those? 19 A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. 20 Q And what I'm getting at is, I go to the 21 does a - runs a blood test on me. Gives m 22 and says, "You're good and bad choles 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those nink it would be of what those y compounds, if ut is there any nable values for doctor and he ne back a report terol levels are	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement was based on. I am not aware of anything in that study that showed behavioral differences, but I'm not aware of data - specific data on behavior.
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sa that's okay. I'm not in your field. B table of known, accepted, you know, reason those? A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. Q And what I'm getting at is, I go to the does a - runs a blood test on me. Gives m and says, "You're good and bad choles this, these are the acceptable ranges. You 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those of what those of what those y compounds, if ut is there any nable values for doctor and he ne back a report terol levels are our enzymes are 1 6 7 9 10 11 A 12 13 A 14 Q 19 A 20 21 22 23 Q	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement was based on. I am not aware of anything in that study that showed behavioral differences, but I'm not aware of data - specific data on behavior. So did you, in exhibit 250, in that report, was a change
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sa that's okay. I'm not in your field. B table of known, accepted, you know, reason those? A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. Q And what I'm getting at is, I go to the does a - runs a blood test on me. Gives m and says, "You're good and bad choles this range, and this is the acceptable of the 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those of what those of what those y compounds, if ut is there any nable values for doctor and he ne back a report terol levels are or good range." 6 7 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 12 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23 23 23 24	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement was based on. I am not aware of anything in that study that showed behavioral differences, but I'm not aware of data - specific data on behavior. So did you, in exhibit 250, in that report, was a change in cow behavior one of the things that was being
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sat that's okay. I'm not in your field. B table of known, accepted, you know, reason those? A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. Q And what I'm getting at is, I go to the does a - runs a blood test on me. Gives m and says, "You're good and bad choles this, these are the acceptable ranges. You this range, and this is the acceptable of the 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those of what those of what those y compounds, if ut is there any nable values for doctor and he ne back a report terol levels are or good range." attle regarding in exhibit 254 7 9 10 11 11 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 14 12 15 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23 24 25	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement was based on. I am not aware of anything in that study that showed behavioral differences, but I'm not aware of data - specific data on behavior. So did you, in exhibit 250, in that report, was a change in cow behavior one of the things that was being measured?
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sat that's okay. I'm not in your field. B table of known, accepted, you know, reason those? A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. Q And what I'm getting at is, I go to the does a - runs a blood test on me. Gives m and says, "You're good and bad choles this, these are the acceptable ranges. You this range, and this is the acceptable of the system? 	in exhibit 254 . You couldn't, there's known values. Those of what those of what those y compounds, if ut is there any nable values for e back a report terol levels are or good range." attle regarding 6 10 11 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 14 12 15 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 4	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement was based on. I am not aware of anything in that study that showed behavioral differences, but I'm not aware of data - specific data on behavior. So did you, in exhibit 250, in that report, was a change in cow behavior one of the things that was being measured? That was not the major purpose of this. The major
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sat that's okay. I'm not in your field. B table of known, accepted, you know, reason those? A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. Q And what I'm getting at is, I go to the does a - runs a blood test on me. Gives m and says, "You're good and bad choles this, these are the acceptable ranges. You this range, and this is the acceptable of So there's nothing like that for dairy cattle. 	i in exhibit 2546. You couldn't, there's known7Q8you couldn't, there's known9values. Those10nink it would be of what those11A1213A14Qy compounds, if ut is there any mable values for15A14Q15A1619Adoctor and he he back a report terol levels are or good range."23Q24attle regarding2526Aly is. There are27	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement was based on. I am not aware of anything in that study that showed behavioral differences, but I'm not aware of data - specific data on behavior. So did you, in exhibit 250, in that report, was a change in cow behavior one of the things that was being measured? That was not the major purpose of this. The major purpose was to measure the immune function.
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sat that's okay. I'm not in your field. B table of known, accepted, you know, reason those? A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. Q And what I'm getting at is, I go to the does a - runs a blood test on me. Gives m and says, "You're good and bad choles this, these are the acceptable ranges. You this range, and this is the acceptable of So there's nothing like that for dairy catheir immune system? A For immunoglobulin levels, there probab some numbers that you might think are him for the cytokines, I'm not aware of any 	i in exhibit 2546. You couldn't, there's known7Q8you couldn't, there's known9values. Those10nink it would be of what those11A1213A14Qy compounds, if ut is there any mable values for15A14Q15A1619Adoctor and he he back a report terol levels are or good range."23Q24attle regarding ut is. There are tend how. But thing like that.29	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement was based on. I am not aware of anything in that study that showed behavioral differences, but I'm not aware of data - specific data on behavior. So did you, in exhibit 250, in that report, was a change in cow behavior one of the things that was being measured? That was not the major purpose of this. The major purpose was to measure the immune function. Was there any data obtained from that research which would allow someone to make any type of - or draw any
 and described by Dr. Chase in exhibit 275 off of the top of your head, say that values for these that are acceptable? A Well, those are different than protein values are Messenger RNA values, and I the very difficult to find standard values would be. Q What about on the various cytokines, the p and anti-inflammatory, and I'm going to sat that's okay. I'm not in your field. B table of known, accepted, you know, reason those? A Not that I'm aware of for cattle. Q And what I'm getting at is, I go to the does a - runs a blood test on me. Gives m and says, "You're good and bad choles this, these are the acceptable ranges. You this range, and this is the acceptable of So there's nothing like that for dairy catter immune system? A For immunoglobulin levels, there probab some numbers that you might think are him 	i in exhibit 2546. You couldn't, there's known7Q8you couldn't, there's known9values. Those10nink it would be of what those11A1213A14Qy compounds, if ut is there any mable values for15A14Q15A1619Adoctor and he he back a report terol levels are or good range."23Q24attle regarding2526Aly is. There are tend for low. But tthing like that.29	data about health measures for that. So, were your conclusions in the 1999 Science Advisors, Part III, he calls it an experiment, I believe it was research, so you didn't come to these conclusions that Dr. Martin comes to here, is that correct? We are referring here to MR. THORNTON: 250. 250. Yes. Okay. As I recall, that was a statement that was made based on the - I don't know what that statement was based on about behavior. Are you talking about Frank Martin's statement? Yes. I don't recall - I don't know what that statement was based on. I am not aware of anything in that study that showed behavioral differences, but I'm not aware of data - specific data on behavior. So did you, in exhibit 250, in that report, was a change in cow behavior one of the things that was being measured? That was not the major purpose of this. The major purpose was to measure the immune function. Was there any data obtained from that research which

Star Blends, et al., Page 181 Page 183 your 1 milliamp exposure testing? I think so, yes. 1 1 A 2 А There were some things that one might call behavior. 2 0 And you're not a trained statistician? 3 0 What were those? зА No, I am not. 4 Α Things like feed consumption and water in-take were 4 Q And you said it would be best to adjust for the multiple 5 measured. I don't know if you'd call those behaviors or 5 variables that you were looking for, but you didn't do not, but those were measured. They were analyzed. I 6 that? 6 7 don't recall the results of those. As I - well, I better 7 А I did that initial analysis. No, I did not. 8 not say, because I really don't recall the results of 8 0 And you're not an electrical engineer or have no 9 those particular analyses. I don't recall anyone ever 9 particular expertise in electricity, do you? 10 discussing any usual changes in feed or water 10 А No, I have no expertise in that area. 11 consumption. 11 Q Who handled the administration of the electricity for the 12 I'm not aware of any other measures of 12 tests that ended up in table 254? 13 behavior other than general comments that were made in 13 Α Dr. Reinemann suggested an individual, whose name escapes 14 the barn notes, which I had never looked at before today. 14 me now, to design the device to administer the current. 0 0 15 Such as the cow - -15 And do you know - -А 16 А Such as - -16 So he designed the equipment to administer the current to the cows. Do you have another question? 17 Q If I can finish. And that's what I was wondering. Was 17 18 Q 18 there any effort made during your research for exhibit I want to make sure you're done with your answer. 19 250 that would have recorded or in some way measured 19 А I was the one that actually attached it to the cows. 20 Q animal behavior, such as lapping at water, stomping, 20 Do you know anything about the credentials, skills or 21 kicking, things along that - twitching, things along 21 competence of the individual that designed the device? 22 those lines? 22 A At the time I had looked at his credentials, but I don't 23 A Not that I'm aware of. 23 recall what they were. 24 And you were involved in that research from start to Q And you lack credentials to make sure that the device was () 24 25 finish, correct? 25 properly attached to the cow, didn't you? 26 26 A A I did not do very much in the barn. Other people were Well, I can tell if it was properly attached. It had 27 27 indicator lights on it to indicate that it was working. involved in that. I was mostly involved in analyzing the 28 28 laboratory bench-type analysis of the blood samples that What I would lack is expertise in determining whether it 29 were collected. 29 was properly designed. **30** Q And why did nobody else participate in the second study **30** Q Did you see a copy of exhibit 250 before it was submitted Page 182 Page 184 to the State of Minnesota? that you did? 1 1 A I believe so. Well, Dr. Reinemann did participate in assisting in 2 2 Α 0 And in you review of that, did you see any indications 3 designing the equipment and figuring out how to 3 4 that cow behavior, other than like feed in-take and water 4 administer the electricity to the cows, the current to 5 in-take, the things I was talking about, the lapping at 5 the cows. This was very heavily involved in looking at 6 water, fidgeting, and that sort of thing, did you see any 6 the immune function. We weren't measuring a lot of other 7 indication that any of those behaviors were ever measured 7 things in it. And so, I was - for this part of that 8 or recorded? 8 study, and the time, we had no need to have other people 9 A I don't recall them being recorded, and I don't recall 9 involved in there. any discussion of recording specifically like that for 10 10 0 Well, in my experience, there is usually multiple authors 11 this study. 11 of these types of reports. You're the only one who's indicated as an author on this study. Why is that? And if I'm correct, and I apologize if I'm rehashing. 12 Q 12 Did that report, the Part III report, conclude that 1 13 13 А That's because I had prepared the report. And that's the 14 milliamp current had an effect on the health of treated 14 reason I put my name on there. There are a few other 15 cows at a highly statistically significant level? 15 people I probably could have put on there. 16 I don't recall that conclusion. 16 0 Had you had any kind of falling out with Dr. Reinemann? Α Have you seen Frank Martin's complete re-analysis of your Α Not that I know. He may have felt so, but I don't recall 17 0 17 work where he comes to that conclusion? anything that was a falling out with him. 18 18 No, I haven't. 19 0 We talked to some extent when we talked the last time 19 А 20 0 So, I take it you're not able to opine as to whether 20 that there's a difference between biological significance 21 Frank Martin's methods and conclusions are valid? 21 and statistical significance? Yes. 22 Without seeing it, no, I can't. 22 Α Α 23 0 That's all I have. 23 0 What would you describe the term biological significance 24 24 to mean? **RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION** 25 25 А Biological significance refers to affecting the overall 26 26 function of the organism in some way. 27 BY MR. THORNTON: 27 0 And did you see any evidence of biological significance 28 28 in either the first study or the second study? Q Dr. Sheffield, you did all the statistical work for the 29 29 А The second study, you really could not assess biological second study that you did?

30

30

significance in, because we were simply measuring

	· · ·	May 2, 2014
	Page 185	Page 187
1	Messenger RNA levels, not any higher level functions.	1 So there are many steps between the
2	The first study we - the study was not big enough to	2 Messenger RNA and the actual protein being detected. For
3	measure things like disease incidents. So, if you're	3 some genes, it's possible to see a bigger change in one
4	looking for that as a biological response, it would have	4 than the other. They often parallel each other, but they
5	been an inadequate study for that.	5 don't have to.
6	In general, I would say little effect. You	6 For example, for certain cytokines, there
7	might consider something like IgA to be a biological	7 are reports where the level of Messenger RNA changes more
8	significance. I wouldn't. I would consider biological	8 than the level of protein in the blood does. And I
9	significance to mean something, such as in this case,	9 believe that's what I was referring to there, was the
10	mastitis incidents, milk production or other such things	10 fact that they're measuring very different things and
11	that would be of potential interest to a dairy farmer as	11 they don't always - one does not always reflect the other
12	opposed to serum antibody levels, that's of more interest	12 one. This is because there are things affecting the
13	to a researcher.	13 protein in addition to the amount of Messenger RNA that
-		14 is there.
14 Q		
15 A	Well, we didn't report it, just because we knew the study	15 Q So, Messenger RNA is associated with the electricity
16	would be too small to report them.	16 that's being administered, or can be?
17 Q		17 A The Messenger RNA could be affected by that. The
-		
18	reasonable degree of scientific certainty from either	18 Messenger RNA - I'm trying to think how to explain this.
19	study other than more study should be done?	19 It's the first step in making a biological response, or
20 A		is often the first step in making the biological a
		· · · ·
21 Q		21 response.
22	opinions that you can come to to a reasonable degree of	22 Q And the biological response is the creation of proteins
23	scientific certainty based on either study, other than	23 to fight the antigens?
24	more study needs to be done?	24 A That could be a biological response, yes.
25	MR. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	25 Q But if I'm understanding you correct, some of the
26 A	All of the conclusions that I could come to reasonably	26 proteins that were being observed were not necessarily
27	would be about things like Messenger RNA levels, or	associated with the Messenger RNA?
28	levels of protein in the blood, and would be suggestive	28 A I think that what we're getting at here is two different
29	of overall health effects at best. Rather than saying	29 ideas. The Messenger RNA is not perfectly correlated
30	health effects to a scientific certainty, if that's kind	30 with the protein in terms of how much of it is there.
	•	-
	Page 186	Page 188
	-	
1	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite	1 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA
1 2	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite	1 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA
2	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question.	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms
2 3 Q	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the
2 3 Q 4	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger
2 3 Q 4 5	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct?	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of
2 3 Q 4 5	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues?	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made.
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems.	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA?
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be.	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be.	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA?
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point.
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity?	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11 12 A	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes.	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing?
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes.	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11 12 A	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11 12 A 13 Q 14	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11 12 A 13 Q 14 15	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that?	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured.
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11 12 A 13 Q 14 15 16 A	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11 12 A 13 Q 14 15	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured.
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11 12 A 13 Q 14 15 16 A 17	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 8 9 10 2 11 12 4 13 2 14 15 16 7 18	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11 A 13 Q 14 15 16 A 17 18 19	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 10 12 12 13 0 14 15 16 4 17 18 19 20	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription.	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 10 Q 11 A 12 A 13 Q 14 15 16 A 17 18 19	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have
2 3 Q 4 5 6 A 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 Q 11 A 13 Q 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review because of that possible criticism
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 10 12 4 13 0 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA using the DNA and the cells nucleus as a template. That	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review because of that possible criticism of the.
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 10 12 4 13 0 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA using the DNA and the cells nucleus as a template. That Messenger RNA then under-goes a process called	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review because of that possible criticism of it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 10 12 12 13 0 14 15 16 4 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA using the DNA and the cells nucleus as a template. That Messenger RNA then under-goes a process called translation in which it's used as a template to produce a	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review secure a peer review?
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 10 12 4 13 0 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA using the DNA and the cells nucleus as a template. That Messenger RNA then under-goes a process called translation in which it's used as a template to produce a protein sequence. In the case of proteins that are in	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review because of that possible criticism of it. Q So, not only was there a singular author, there was never a peer review?
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 0 11 12 4 13 0 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA using the DNA and the cells nucleus as a template. That Messenger RNA then under-goes a process called translation in which it's used as a template to produce a protein sequence. In the case of proteins that are in	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review because of that possible criticism of it. Q So, not only was there a singular author, there was never a peer review?
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 0 11 12 4 13 0 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA using the DNA and the cells nucleus as a template. That Messenger RNA then under-goes a process called translation in which it's used as a template to produce a protein sequence. In the case of proteins that are in serum, that protein is then processed and excreted from	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review because of that possible criticism of it. Q So, not only was there a singular author, there was never a peer review?
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 0 11 12 A 13 0 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA using the DNA and the cells nucleus as a template. That Messenger RNA then under-goes a process called translation in which it's used as a template to produce a protein sequence. In the case of proteins that are in serum, that protein is then processed and excreted from the cells. And what you measured in the serum is a	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review because of that possible criticism of it. Q So, not only was there a singular author, there was never a peer review? A No. That's correct. Q Why was the study done the way it was? A In terms of measuring the Messenger RNA?
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 0 11 12 A 13 0 11 12 A 13 0 14 15 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA using the DNA and the cells nucleus as a template. That Messenger RNA then under-goes a process called translation in which it's used as a template to produce a protein sequence. In the case of proteins that are in serum, that protein is then processed and excreted from the cells. And what you measured in the serum is a mixture of the rate at which that protein is secreted,	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review because of that possible criticism of it. Q So, not only was there a singular author, there was never a peer review? A No. That's correct. Q Why was the study done the way it was? A In terms of measuring the Messenger RNA?
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 0 11 12 A 13 0 14 15 16 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA using the DNA and the cells nucleus as a template. That Messenger RNA then under-goes a process called translation in which it's used as a template to produce a protein sequence. In the case of proteins that are in serum, that protein is then processed and excreted from the cells. And what you measured in the serum is a mixture of the rate at which that protein is secreted, the volume that it gets distributed in the body, and the	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review because of that possible criticism of it. Q So, not only was there a singular author, there was never a peer review? A No. That's correct. Q Why was the study done the way it was? A In terms of measuring the Messenger RNA? A Well, that is the first step in producing these proteins.
2 3 4 5 6 7 0 8 4 9 0 0 11 12 A 13 0 11 12 A 13 0 14 15 A 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	of what you are getting at, I guess I don't know quite what you're getting at in the question. Well, I think you indicated and your paper indicated that there was some issues with assay collections and assay analyzation, is that correct? Issues? Problems. Well, early on, yes, some of the - some of the assays were not as feasible as we thought they would be. And problems with the assay collection and assay analyzation is going to effect the data integrity? If not corrected, they could, yes. And explain this to me. You say in some cases the activity changed, but the expression level didn't, when you're talking about genes. What do you mean by that? In the second study we are measuring Messenger RNA levels. In the first study, we're measuring the levels of protein in the blood. There's several steps in between those. The first step in producing the protein is called transcription. This is the production of the Messenger RNA using the DNA and the cells nucleus as a template. That Messenger RNA then under-goes a process called translation in which it's used as a template to produce a protein sequence. In the case of proteins that are in serum, that protein is then processed and excreted from the cells. And what you measured in the serum is a mixture of the rate at which that protein is secreted,	 That's the point I was trying to make. The Messenger RNA corresponds to, in a certain sense, the protein in terms of the sequence of the Messenger RNA determines the sequence of the protein. But the level of the Messenger RNA is one of several factors that determines how much of the protein is being made. Q But there is a relationship between the production of antigen fighting protein and the Messenger RNA? A Yes. There is a relationship. It is not a perfect relationship. That was my point. Q Okay. Why did you decide that your second paper wasn't worth publishing? A I never published it. It was a fairly - it's - although there's a lot of Messengers there, it was a fairly small study in terms of the sorts of things that were measured. I looked at it and I thought as soon as I tried to publish it, it's very likely that someone in the review process would say, "But have you actually seen the change in the protein levels," or other things that could have been measured. And I - I just did not think it would withstand peer review because of that possible criticism of it. Q So, not only was there a singular author, there was never a peer review? A No. That's correct. Q Why was the study done the way it was? A In terms of measuring the Messenger RNA?

Star H	Blends, et al., v. von	inne 2	May 9, 2014
	Page 189		Page 191
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Q 21 A 22 23 24 25 26 Q 7 Q	The environmental, it might change. Could that change the results? And that is what is meant by the blocking effect. And it's the statistical technique to correct for the fact that the cows weren't - the three groups weren't all at the same time, there was a sequential factor to it.	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 4 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 4 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 9 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 21 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 22 \\ 24 \\ 25 \\ 24 \\ 25 \\ 24 \\ 25 \\ 24 \\ 26 \\ 17 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 29 \\ 20 \\ 20 \\ 20 \\ 20 \\ 20 \\ 20 \\ 20 \\ 20$	But when we compared the treatment group at the beginning and at the end, the difference between the IgA serum levels was not statistically significant? That's what this result indicates. And the difference between the two is dramatic, statistically speaking, right?
10 11 12 13 14 A 15 Q 16 A 17 Q 18 A 17 Q 18 A 19 Q 21 22 23 Q 21 22 23 Q 24 A 25 Q 26 Q 27 A	different in January and May and August, isn't it? Yes. Yes. Now, in the first test, 250, you talked about co-variants. You did a comparison of the animals, what their condition was when they started, and what their condition was when you stopped the test in terms of protein production, correct? That's right. Yes. And you didn't do that in the second test? That's correct. And what do you mean by covariant? A covariant is a variable that might influence the results that you were trying to control for. So, for example, when Mr. Lawrence pointed out to you that the P value on exhibit 278 for IgA serum was .7932, that was the beginning and end - that was based on data at the beginning and end of the treatment, correct? Let me get to that exhibit. You're referring to 278? 278, it's about the fifth box from the bottom. Do you see there's handwritten in there, IgA serum? IgA serum. And it shows a P value of .7932? Okay. Yes.	2 t 3 4 Q 5 A 6 Q 7 8 A 9 i 10 v 11 1 12	Page 192 Well, they were randomly selected or randomly assigned to reatments, and I do not know why there was a difference initially at the start in IgA. But there definitely was? There was, yes. And that would indicate, as to this criteria, these cows were not random? It just indicates that they were different. I don't know if that gets into a question of what random means. But we had - when we assigned them to the treatment, we had no idea what the IgA levels were. So. But it is some- thing that was different in the two groups. I gotta hit the airport. Let's go off the record. (3:24 o'clock p.m.) * * * * *

Min-U-Script®

	Page 193	
1	READING AND SIGNING CERTIFICATE	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 2	I, LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, do hereby certify that I have read the foregoing transcript of my deposition, recorded by John T. Kirby, of 5-9-14, and believe the same to be true and correct, (or except as follows, noting the page and line number of the change or addition and the reason why): WRITING IN TRANSCRIPT WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED	
23 24		
25		
26 27		
28	DATE SIGNATURE	
29 30		
	Page 194	
1	STATE OF MINNESOTA)	
2) ss. COUNTY OF DAKOTA)	
3 4	Be it known that I took the deposition of	
4 5	LEWIS G. SHEFFIELD, on the 9th day of May, 2014, at	
6 7	Madison, Wisconsin; That I was then and there a notary public	
8	in and for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and	
9 10	that by virtue thereof, I was duly authorized to administer an oath;	
11	That the witness before testifying was by	
12 13	me first duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth relative to said cause;	
$13 \\ 14$	That the testimony of said witness was	
15	recorded in computerized Stenotype and thereafter	
16 17	transcribed by myself, and that the testimony is a true record of the testimony given by the witness to the best	
18	of my ability;	
19 20	That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the matter;	
21 22	That the reading and the signing has been executed as evidenced by the preceding page.	
23		
24 25	WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL THIS 12TH DAY OF MAY, 2014.	
26		
27		

Volume 2

A abbreviation (3) 101:19;106:30; 117:23 abbreviations (1) 98:22 ABC(1) 81:10 ability (2) 104:6;194:18 able (5) 135:13;137:10; 153:28;166:22;182:20 above (2) 84:18;95:21 absolutely (1) 128:22 abstract (1) 176:28 acceptable (4) 177:20:178:9.23.24 accepted (4) 164:5;177:26; 178:17:193:9 accomplish (1) 89:5 accordance (1) 90:6 according (4) 110:21;149:27; 155:19;171:6 account (3) 143:10;149:7;153:9 accounted (1) 137:12 accounting (1) 138:24 accounts (2) 116:12:143:4 accurate (3) 118:25;141:23; 160:26 ACK2 (3) 89:16;91:27;99:19 across (2) 98:15;127:5 actions (1) 130:19 activated (2) 101:2:102:23 activators (1) 100:15 activity (7) 95:7.19:97:18; 102:20;125:15;128:4; 186:14 actual (5) 137:29,30;138:14; 149:23;187:2 Actually (37) 90:20,23;94:17;96:8;

97:30;102:24;104:16; 106:14.20.28:108:30: 109:1.13:110:6: 112:24:115:30:120:30: 122:11:126:21:135:17: 139:2;149:5,25;150:2; 151:1,14,29;154:1,11, 30;158:15;162:30; 163:14;164:5;167:29; 183:19:188:18 acute (4) 119:19,21:121:21; 161:14 add (2) 100:17;129:2 added (1) 96:24 addition (3) 138:13;187:13;193:7 address (2) 113:18;169:29 addresses (1) 170:1 Adenyl (1) 94:5 adipokine (2) 122:30;123:2 A-d-i-p-o-k-i-n-e (1) 123:2 adipose (3) 122:10:123:3.5 adjust (1) 183:4 adjust-(1) 123:16 adjustment (6) 113:5;114:10,19; 115:9;117:13;123:12 adjustments (4) 113:3,8,17:114:4 administer (4) 183:14,16;184:4; 194:10 administered (2) 187:16;191:9 administration (1) 183:11 advance (1) 176:11 adverse (1) 122:13 Advisors (2) 179:25:180:7 affect (3) 93:15;100:20,21 affected (5) 86:23;93:9,16; 153:28;187:17 affecting (2) 184:25;187:12 afternoon (1) 169:10 afterwards (1)

135:6 AG (2) 108:26:167:12 Again (26) 84:3,28;85:18;93:11: 97:26;99:15,20;106:5; 112:19.29:114:24: 122:23;123:11;124:15; 128:9;139:16;144:28; 145:30;146:2;149:2; 152:16;155:9;157:9; 159:21:161:11:180:5 against (1) 170:6 age (1) 151:7 agent (1) 100:18 ago (16) 85:9;86:4;87:29; 90:17;99:3;112:16; 116:9;121:29;122:12; 134:22.29:146:4: 164:24;168:30;175:15; 177:3 agree (72) 89:7;91:21,28;92:4; 99:9,21,28;100:27,30; 101:26,28;102:17; 103:5;105:19;106:4,7, 27:107:3,6,8,11,21,28, 29:108:1.13.15: 110:20;112:18;116:23; 117:26.30:118:12.16. 18,20,30;123:24,26,28, 30;124:2,4,6,7,18,21, 23,26,28,30;125:2,19; 126:13;127:2,26; 128:19;129:1,13,17; 131:20,23,28,30;132:2, 5,13,22;162:16; 177:10;179:27;180:1 agreed (1) 126:15 agreeing (1) 124:18 Agriculture (5) 85:17,28;86:1,2; 168:11 ahead (8) 88:9:99:14.27; 105:26;122:4;143:3; 154:10:175:30 airport (1) 192:13 al (3) 83:17,18;173:7 algorithm (1) 90:13 all' (1) 133:3 allow (1) 180:29

allowed (1) 188:30 alluded (1) 122:10 ally (2) 93:20:115:11 Almost (7) 100:13:104:27; 107:15;111:5;129:3,4; 130:4 along (4) 86:16;114:16; 181:21,21 aloud (1) 114:29 alpha (14) 98:25;116:19,24; 117:6;119:8;125:6; 131:21;132:11,20; 157:29;160:22;161:2, 12,22 alterations (1) 131:16 alternative (4) 125:27;134:15,15,18 although (6) 95:7,17;112:25; 139:10;149:10;188:13 alveoli (1) 163:11 always (9) 121:11:128:3:133:5. 5.6:146:14:152:23: 187:11.11 American (1) 91:8 among (4) 104:1:156:7:163:17: 169:25 amount (1) 187:13 amounts (5) 96:2;121:3;132:17; 163:3,4 analyses (5) 134:18;139:6; 145:15;149:15;181:9 analysis (73) 111:24,28;112:6,7; 113:6;137:7,12,25,29, 30,30;138:7,10,23,27, 30:139:8.12.14.21: 140:1.13.17:141:17.19. 24;142:2,14,16,17,27; 143:12,18;145:7,18,20, 27;146:11;148:21; 149:4,8,10,19,20,21; 150:1;151:12,16; 152:18,19;153:2,11,17; 154:17:155:4,6,7,19, 20,21,29;156:3;158:4; 159:26:160:26:164:30: 174:26;179:15;181:28; appears (32)

183:7:189:4:190:2; 191:3 analyzation (2) 186:5.11 analyze (5) 134:24;140:16; 142:19.23:177:5 analyzed (13) 141:29;143:9,16; 151:18;153:4;154:19; 155:1;174:24;177:7,9, 11:178:6:181:6 analyzing (6) 136:25;141:30; 142:14;153:13;155:7; 181:27 and/or (1) 174:4 animal (8) 109:10;110:16; 119:21;142:20;143:5, 6,7;181:20 animals (8) 89:23,24;105:13; 150:16;154:13;157:8; 190:10;191:6 answered (5) 100:9;109:28,30; 123:6;127:22 antagonist (2) 117:23.25 antibodies (1) 108:4 anti-bodies (1) 163:18 antibody (6) 108:28,30;109:3,4; 112:26:185:12 anti-body (2) 162:27:163:2 antigen (1) 188:8 antigens (1) 187:23 anti-inflammatory (2) 119:2;178:15 apologize (4) 144:27,29;176:10; 182:12 apparently (4) 137:20;140:8; 151:26:169:24 appear (13) 83:27;84:10,11; 87:26;136:9,15,24; 141:11;151:5;169:29; 170:18;172:29;173:1 **APPEARANCES (2)** 82:1;83:25 appeared (5) 82:5,11,16:87:1; 149:8

Min-U-Script®

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

(1) abbreviation - appears

115:10:127:14; 130:21:135:24:137:4. 9.22:138:17:139:25. 29:142:7:145:22: 146:29:149:20.22: 151:11,17;155:17,21; 157:5,5,10;159:8,14; 160:8;166:4,8;167:7; 168:4;170:22;172:22; 173:2 Apple (2) 82:23:83:23 applied (11) 139:8;148:18,27; 149:6,11,13,23,30; 153:5;170:5;174:3 apply (2) 113:16;143:28 applying (1) 174:20 appointment (1) 159:17 appreciate (1) 170:13 appro- (1) 140:12 approach (1) 93:19 approached (1) 174:6 appropriate (7) 138:30:139:11: 140:14.18:147:5: 149:12:153:11 approximately (9) 81:29;83:14;114:7; 115:9;121:15;133:14; 158:6;164:8;165:7 April (1) 86:28 Arabic (2) 107:1,2 Arctic (1) 81:5 area (5) 121:25;122:3,21; 133:17;183:10 arising (1) 110:23 arithmetic (2) 89:21,23 around (6) 96:26;97:14;116:2; 119:8;140:19;151:29 ARRAY (6) 87:3;159:7,7,7,8,14 arrive (1) 90:4 artfully (1) 177:16 article (4) 172:23,29;173:1,2 A's (1)

116:20 Ash (1) 82:14 aspect (2) 93:22;100:10 aspects (1) 93:13 Assay (5) 108:26;186:4,4,10, 10 assays (4) 153:6,29;174:28; 186:8 assess (5) 86:10;101:27; 161:26;184:29;188:30 assessment (9) 92:3;99:28;101:21, 26;102:6;103:5; 105:19;107:11;131:23 assessments (1) 126:13 assign (1) 151:3 assigned (3) 144:2;192:1,10 assignment (1) 191:25 assistants (1) 157:3 assisting (1) 184:2 associated (10) 99:11:126:9:128:20: 131:12:155:30:156:8; 161:14;173:8;187:15, 27 Association (2) 91:8:134:5 Associations (1) 172:23 assume (6) 93:3;108:8;114:8; 127:2;160:18;164:6 assumed (2) 100:3;146:13 assumes (1) 142:17 assuming (8) 89:14;100:1;106:26; 120:25;137:9;164:11, 17:172:1 assumption (2) 96:23;160:28 assumptions (3) 114:21;126:16,17 **ATP (1)** 94:5 ATPase (1) 94:6 attach (1) 104:7 attached (3)

183:19,25,26 attempt (1) 172:26 attempted (1) 149:11 attend (1) 134:3 attorney (1) 83:28 attorneys (1) 176:14 ATTORNEYS@LDLAWSTNCOM (1) 82:5 August (2) 153:17;190:7 author (4) 168:15;172:26; 184:12;188:23 authoritative (2) 177:19,24 authorized (1) 194:9 authors (1) 184:10 available (3) 88:4,11;175:3 Avenue (2) 82:3,14 average (3) 89:20,21,23 aware (13) 112:8.9:156:6: 162:14:177:19.25: 178:3.19.29:180:20.21: 181:12,23 away (3) 90:19,23,25 awhile (1) 175:15 B **B1**(1) 129:26 **B2**(1) 130:5 back (21) 87:7;88:5;90:14,15; 91:26;100:25;114:25, 27;115:22;116:15; 123:6;126:1;134:11; 135:18:141:5.15: 158:22,28;165:4; 176:2;178:21 background (2) 133:1,7 bacteria (3) 96:11,19:163:15 bacterium (1) 96:8 bad (4) 103:11:168:1:169:5; 178:22

ballpark (2) 105:27:118:4 barn (9) 141:8.11:166:3: 167:3,24,28;181:14,26; 189:19 barrier (1) 149:30 **base** (1) 139:30 based (11) 99:16:112:19; 113:24;114:10,19; 180:16,16,20;185:23; 190:22;191:5 basic (7) 89:4;123:7,22; 124:10,25;126:11; 150:14 basically (8) 85:24;89:27;103:28; 141:28;149:4;150:29; 155:9:178:1 basil (1) 95:22 Bates (4) 137:16;166:11; 167:28;169:14 batgerium (1) 96:9 begin (1) 148:9 beginning (6) 86:12:145:19: 148:10:190:22,23; 191:13 begins (2) 143:15:168:19 behalf (1) 176:16 behavior (14) 120:9;171:17,23,29; 179:26,29;180:17,22, 24,30;181:2,13,20; 182:4 behavioral (1) 180:21 behaviors (2) 181:5;182:7 bell (1) 90:19 below (1) 170:1 bench-type (1) 181:28 beside (1) 127:1 best (8) 114:4;130:2;140:16; 141:30:178:6:183:4: 185:29:194:17 beta (12) 94:29;98:25;116:28;

117:4,7;119:8;124:3; 157:29:160:23:161:3. 12.22 better (6) 114:26:173:6: 177:13,14;178:6;181:7 beyond (2) 111:25,29 big (3) 162:17,19;185:2 bigger (4) 86:19;119:22;149:7; 187:3 bind (1) 129:29 binding (3) 129:25,28;130:5 biological (13) 184:20,23,25,27,29; 185:4,7,8,20;187:19, 20,22,24 biology (1) 120:8 Bird (4) 84:11;115:15,23; 176:15 bit (14) 86:24;91:27;96:26; 97:14;113:4;122:1; 134:28;139:3;140:19; 147:15,16,22;162:29; 163:8 blastoenesis (1) 151:28 Blends (2) 81:8;83:18 block (16) 137:12:138:30; 139:1,9,10,11,12; 140:13,18;152:17,21, 22:153:10:156:4: 189:3.30 blocked (5) 136:21,28;138:7; 153:13;155:11 blocker (1) 137:25 blocking (2) 155:12;189:22 blocks (2) 138:4,24 blood (21) 108:20,28;109:19; 110:3,13:136:17; 155:27;167:4;174:14, 18,23;176:26;177:5,7, 11,17;178:21;181:28; 185:28;186:18;187:8 Boardman (1) 83:20

body (18) 100:3,12,13;101:3; 102:22,30;108:29;

Star Blends, et al.,	1		T	May 9, 2014
100.12.121.6.125.0.	90:9	97.12 14.92.4.94.12	105.7 20.100.21.	156.14 19 22.
109:13;121:6;125:9;		82:13,14;83:4;84:13,	105:7,29;109:21;	156:14,18,23;
130:12;132:17;151:16,	calculators (1)	13;101:7,13,17;	110:2,3,7;125:9;	166:27;167:1
17;163:7,14;186:29,30	90:7	106:19;120:18;129:20;	131:15;132:17;186:22,	Charles (1)
Bonferroni (10)	call (14)	167:16;175:29;176:6	27	84:11
113:3,20,24;114:10,	96:17;97:17;102:7,	carry (1)	Center (1)	Charlie (1)
15;115:9,11;117:12;	18;103:25;108:30;	96:12	82:9	176:15
123:12,16	113:26,30;115:8,15;	Case (24)	certain (7)	Chase (17)
book (1)	143:24;163:15;181:2,5	83:19;84:2,10;88:14;	96:19;100:14;122:5;	91:6;103:9;105:24;
90:15	called (28)	89:9,21;101:15;117:4,	136:27;162:24;187:6;	106:26;107:19;118:12;
boost (1)	88:6,24;89:30;96:21;	6,6;119:14;144:18;	188:2	124:2;125:21;126:26;
170:4	98:17;103:12;109:5;	146:2;159:24,25;	certainly (10)	127:19;128:19;129:13;
both (6)	116:19;120:8,17,20;	173:29;175:16;176:23,	88:18;92:14;99:26;	130:24;132:14,26;
82:6;101:9;103:1;	126:22;127:3,25;	24;179:24;185:9;	111:20;135:2;150:11;	133:24;178:7
107:2;110:28;151:20	129:28;131:7;142:15,	186:25;189:29;191:27	161:2,13,16;171:26	Chase's (18)
bother (1)	28;143:17;145:8;	Casein (5)	certainty (3)	91:29;99:9,22;
165:22	163:11;177:23;179:6,	94:6;96:6;97:2;99:2;	185:18,23,30	100:27;107:28;108:7;
bottom (14)	8;186:20,23;189:29;	132:26	CERTIFICATE (1)	112:17;116:16,23;
89:15,29;94:11;95:4;	190:3	cases (5)	193:1	117:26,30;120:2;
131:19;139:27;152:5;	calling (2)	92:1;101:9;102:26;	certify (1)	123:22;125:3,19;
159:13;166:15;168:4,	177:23;178:5	121:2;186:13	193:3	126:12,16;129:1
21;172:13;173:4;	calls (2)	CasKin1 (1)	cetera (1)	check (4)
190:25	180:8;191:23	101:19	167:24	125:22;138:19;
Box (3)	came (20)	CasKin2 (1)	cFos (9)	151:25;157:20
82:3,15;190:25	85:7,17,24,28,30;	101:25	99:21;100:10,11,13,	checking (1)
break (10)	95:23;110:3;116:13;	Cass (1)	16,19,21,24;101:1	151:26
115:17,17,23;135:5,	122:12;137:2;144:19;	84:7	chain (4)	CHEM (1)
6;163:23;167:13;	153:25,26;154:2;	catalytic (1)	100:11;112:14,15;	143:17
172:4,6;175:15	156:27;157:1;158:11,	98:24	161:8	chemilumi- (1)
briefly (1)	16;165:10;169:4	category (6)	chance (2)	145:17
141:5	Campbelltown (1)	97:28;98:8,10;99:1,	142:3;176:1	chemiluminescence (2)
BRIGGS (1)	163:27	8;100:22	change (48)	143:17,19
82:9	(FF)	(1) (0)		
02.7	can (55)	cattle (8)	91:14,16,17;93:28;	cholesterol (1)
	can (55) 85:12:86:6;88:2,4,7,	cattle (8) 86:10,12,23;105:7;	91:14,16,17;93:28; 94:24:95:9,21;97:10,	cholesterol (1) 178:22
broad (3)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7,	86:10,12,23;105:7;	94:24;95:9,21;97:10,	178:22
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25;	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1;	178:22 choose (3)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6,	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16;
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1,	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11,	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4,	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9,	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronically (2)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronically (2) 161:21;162:9
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronically (2) 161:21;162:9 chronological (1)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronically (2) 161:21;162:9 chronological (1) 135:19
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5)	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronically (2) 161:21;162:9 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronically (2) 161:21;162:9 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22;	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronically (2) 161:21;162:9 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17)	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronically (2) 161:21;162:9 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1)	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronically (2) 161:21;162:9 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19 Circulating (5)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD3 (1)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronlogical (2) 161:21;162:9 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19 Circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8;
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1)	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD3 (1) 102:2	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronically (2) 161:21;162:9 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19 Circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD3 (1) 102:2 CD8 (1)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronlogical (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19 Circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1)	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD3 (1) 102:2	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronlogical (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19 Circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29 calculate (2)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1) 82:6	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD3 (1) 102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 Cdk1 (2)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7 changing (3)	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronlogical (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19 Circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22 circumstances (4)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29 calculate (2) 88:13,18	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1) 82:6 car (2)	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD3 (1) 102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 Cdk1 (2) 102:5,6	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7 changing (3) 93:17;96:22;98:28	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronlogical (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19 Circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22 circumstances (4) 89:6;113:17;140:12;
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29 calculate (2) 88:13,18 calculated (1)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1) 82:6 car (2) 163:20;165:22	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD3 (1) 102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 Cdk1 (2) 102:5,6 cell (8)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7 changing (3) 93:17;96:22;98:28 characteristics (1)	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronlogical (2) 161:21;162:9 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19 Circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22 circumstances (4) 89:6;113:17;140:12; 147:6
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29 calculate (2) 88:13,18	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1) 82:6 car (2) 163:20;165:22 cardio- (1)	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD3 (1) 102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 Cdk1 (2) 102:5,6 cell (8) 100:13,15,17;102:7;	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7 changing (3) 93:17;96:22;98:28 characteristics (1) 150:14	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19 Circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22 circumstances (4) 89:6;113:17;140:12;
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29 calculate (2) 88:13,18 calculated (1) 117:5 calculation (4)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1) 82:6 car (2) 163:20;165:22 cardio- (1) 122:13	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 Cdk1 (2) 102:5,6 cell (8) 100:13,15,17;102:7; 105:29;125:8;131:5,8	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7 changing (3) 93:17;96:22;98:28 characteristics (1) 150:14 characterization (5)	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22 circumstances (4) 89:6;113:17;140:12; 147:6 cJun (2) 100:11,26
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29 calculate (2) 88:13,18 calculated (1) 117:5	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1) 82:6 car (2) 163:20;165:22 cardio- (1)	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD3 (1) 102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 Cdk1 (2) 102:5,6 cell (8) 100:13,15,17;102:7;	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7 changing (3) 93:17;96:22;98:28 characteristics (1) 150:14	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22 circumstances (4) 89:6;113:17;140:12; 147:6 cJun (2)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29 calculate (2) 88:13,18 calculated (1) 117:5 calculation (4)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1) 82:6 car (2) 163:20;165:22 cardio- (1) 122:13	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 Cdk1 (2) 102:5,6 cell (8) 100:13,15,17;102:7; 105:29;125:8;131:5,8	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7 changing (3) 93:17;96:22;98:28 characteristics (1) 150:14 characterization (5)	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22 circumstances (4) 89:6;113:17;140:12; 147:6 cJun (2) 100:11,26
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29 calculate (2) 88:13,18 calculated (1) 117:5 calculation (4) 111:8;137:28,29; 148:23	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1) 82:6 car (2) 163:20;165:22 cardio- (1) 122:13 cardiovascular (1)	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 Cdk1 (2) 102:5,6 cell (8) 100:13,15,17;102:7; 105:29;125:8;131:5,8 cells (30)	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7 changing (3) 93:17;96:22;98:28 characteristics (1) 150:14 characterization (5) 91:29;99:22;100:5;	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22 circumstances (4) 89:6;113:17;140:12; 147:6 cJun (2) 100:11,26 Claire (1)
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29 calculate (2) 88:13,18 calculated (1) 117:5 calculation (4) 111:8;137:28,29;	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1) 82:6 car (2) 163:20;165:22 cardio-(1) 122:13 cardiovascular (1) 122:6	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 Cdk1 (2) 102:5,6 cell (8) 100:13,15,17;102:7; 105:29;125:8;131:5,8 cells (30) 86:21;92:6,20;95:15;	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7 changing (3) 93:17;96:22;98:28 characteristics (1) 150:14 characterization (5) 91:29;99:22;100:5; 107:28,29	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22 circumstances (4) 89:6;113:17;140:12; 147:6 cJun (2) 100:11,26 Claire (1) 81:13
broad (3) 86:14;116:5,6 broader (1) 85:23 broadly (1) 129:22 brought (1) 165:1 BRUGGEN (1) 82:14 budget (1) 85:18 bunch (1) 136:4 C CaATPase (1) 94:5 calcium (3) 94:5;170:4,29 calculate (2) 88:13,18 calculated (1) 117:5 calculation (4) 111:8;137:28,29; 148:23 calculations (1)	85:12;86:6;88:2,4,7, 28;93:11;94:10;99:25; 101:25;102:13;103:6, 11,14;105:17;107:15; 109:25;110:4,13; 111:8;113:18;114:26; 115:5,15;116:1;121:1, 23;123:1;124:13; 125:4;129:5,23;135:4, 5;136:9;137:11; 138:19;142:5,25; 144:7;156:28;157:20; 163:20,24,24;169:5; 173:24;175:18;181:17; 183:26;185:17,21,22; 187:16;189:5 canal (1) 163:16 cance (1) 114:21 captions (1) 82:6 car (2) 163:20;165:22 cardio- (1) 122:13 cardiovascular (1) 122:6 carefully (1)	86:10,12,23;105:7; 172:25;178:19,25; 189:18 cause (2) 121:4;194:13 caused (2) 122:6,7 caveat (2) 139:2,5 CCs (1) 169:28 CD (1) 102:11 CD14 (2) 101:25,26 CD23 (2) 101:29;102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 CD8 (1) 102:2 Cdk1 (2) 102:5,6 cell (8) 100:13,15,17;102:7; 105:29;125:8;131:5,8 cells (30) 86:21;92:6,20;95:15; 96:28;101:3,23;102:3,	94:24;95:9,21;97:10, 24;98:3,4,9,11,14;99:1; 100:15;102:25;104:19; 106:2,5;107:9;109:24; 110:10;112:25,28; 113:15,22,23,24; 115:10;116:3;125:11, 15;126:4;127:28; 128:9;130:7,9;131:9, 15;140:4;161:14; 180:23;187:3;188:18; 189:21,21;193:7 changed (5) 89:27;93:5;104:23; 161:7;186:14 changes (17) 102:26;105:21,21; 109:25;119:22;127:30; 128:3,4,19;129:13; 140:6,7;157:14;161:7; 180:30;181:10;187:7 changing (3) 93:17;96:22;98:28 characteristics (1) 150:14 characterization (5) 91:29;99:22;100:5; 107:28,29 characterizes (1)	178:22 choose (3) 107:24;108:16; 120:21 Chris (1) 91:5 chronic (2) 121:20;122:8 chronological (1) 135:19 CIRCUIT (2) 81:1;83:19 circulates (1) 109:19 Circulating (5) 108:20,28;110:3,8; 162:23 circulation (1) 109:22 circumstances (4) 89:6;113:17;140:12; 147:6 cJun (2) 100:11,26 Claire (1) 81:13 clarified (1)

97:14;120:18 Clark (1) 83:21 classic (2) 103:23:154:3 Classically (1) 95:13 clear (3) 93:9;127:10,19 ClevagePolvA (1) 94:6 ClevPolyA (1) 102:13 clinical (1) 172:24 close (5) 96:17;103:16;114:9; 133:2;167:14 closely (1) 131:4 co- (1) 152:19 co-author (1) 164:1 Code (2) 81:3;149:24 cold (1) 161:30 collagenases (1) 95:5 collated (1) 159:8 collected (6) 174:15.19:177:8: 179:30;181:29;189:10 collection (1) 186:10 collections (1) 186:4 collectively (1) 132:9 College (3) 85:17;86:1,2 column (16) 92:5;94:7,12;97:23; 100:4;105:25;106:29; 108:7;118:6;124:8; 132:14;136:14;145:6, 9,30;146:22 columns (3) 144:28;151:24;158:9 coming (3) 159:26;167:5;176:2 commands (1) 146:24 commencing (1) 81:29 comment (10) 92:4;97:13;127:10, 11,13,14;130:24,26; 163:9;175:17 comments (6) 106:27;126:12;

166:17,20;167:25; 181:13 commercial (3) 161:16.24:162:18 commercially (1) 88:11 common (9) 89:26;94:21;100:12; 102:3,18,30;103:26; 107:12:108:28 commonly (3) 96:20:104:1:134:7 Company (5) 81:10,19;82:17; 83:17;84:6 compare (3) 114:20;177:12,16 compared (2) 191:8,13 comparing (4) 90:1;144:8,9;191:5 comparison (2) 190:10;191:20 competence (1) 183:21 complete (1) 182:17 components (1) 161:18 compounds (1) 178:15 computation (2) 89:4:144:18 computations (2) 113:3:138:14 compute (3) 90:5.5.12 computer (3) 151:2,26;159:27 computerized (1) 194:15 computing (1) 147:12 Concanavalin (1) 151:28 concede (1) 191:28 concept (1) 120:8 concern (4) 101:12:152:27; 168:16:170:21 concerned (1) 169:9 concerns (1) 152:26 conclude (1) 182:13 conclusion (6) 99:10:100:28; 171:25;180:30;182:16, 18 conclusions (8)

109:25;142:13; 180:7.9:182:21: 185:17,21,26 condition (4) 171:26,27;190:11,12 conditions (2) 189:16.20 connection (1) 173:28 consensus (1) 170:23 consequence (1) 161:21 consequences (3) 109:7;121:20;162:21 consider (6) 104:20;113:8; 122:20;147:5;185:7,8 considered (4) 111:6,11;123:4,15 consultant (1) 83:29 consumption (3) 166:6;181:4,11 contact (1) 176:14 contains (1) 87:4 contemplating (1) 92:18 contents (1) 175:17 context (1) 102:18 continue (4) 84:29:94:26:99:24; 121:28 continues (1) 145:21 **Continuing (5)** 81:24;83:15;84:22; 99:25;143:22 control (27) 89:6,10,18;90:2; 96:18;132:27;133:3; 136:26;140:3,8,9; 144:6;148:11,15,15; 152:12;153:26;154:7, 28;155:23,27;171:16, 21;173:19;190:19; 191:8,20 controlling (1) 144:6 controls (7) 86:20;133:11; 136:25;137:23;139:9; 148:4;189:10 controversy (1) 113:4 **Cooperative (3)** 81:19;82:17;84:5 copied (2)86:28;158:25

Volume 2

copies (2) 140:25:165:24 copy (10) 86:28;87:20,24;91:9; 115:25:153:16:155:18: 171:7;172:22;181:30 corner (1) 137:17 corrected (1) 186:12 correction (5) 113:24;114:16; 117:16;132:10;136:29 correctly (11) 85:27;96:30;110:24; 119:1;136:19;139:6; 142:22;148:17;149:13; 151:27;158:2 correlated (3) 142:24,25;187:29 correlation (1) 143:5 corresponds (1) 188:2 counsel (6) 83:25;116:30;135:7; 158:21;174:14;175:28 Counsel's (1) 86:30 counts (1) 119:12 COUNTY (6) 81:1,27;83:19;84:7; 194:2.8 couple (7) 91:11:105:2,4:109:9: 135:25;147:13;149:16 course (3) 86:16;113:6;155:29 COURT (6) 81:1,15;83:19,26; 84:6;114:30 covariant (5) 139:8,13,21;190:17, 18 co-variant (2) 149:30;152:23 co-variants (3) 139:9;155:21;190:10 cover (10) 87:2:99:20:102:14; 135:29:136:11:141:18: 142:6;150:4;159:3; 176:11 covered (6) 98:12;99:2;132:24; 141:16;165:23;176:12 covers (3) 84:7;130:14;155:26 cow (30) 109:8,26:112:23; 119:20:144:8.8: 145:27;146:17,21;

Lewis G. Sheffield May 9, 2014

152:28;159:6;162:22; 168:1.29:169:4.9.20: 170:10.15.17:171:8.11: 172:18:180:24.30: 181:15:182:4:183:25: 190:6.6 cows (48) 89:10,10,19:105:14; 134:6;140:8,9;141:8; 143:11:144:1,2; 145:29;150:15;151:3, 5,7;152:12;153:4,27; 155:25;162:16.28; 163:2;166:28;171:16, 21,30;172:7,15;173:15, 18;174:15;179:26; 180:3;182:15;183:17, 19;184:4,5;189:7,9,11, 13,14,24;191:25,29; 192:6 cows' (1) 162:30 cow's (1) 151:17 cow-trainers (4) 172:24;173:8,11,16 COX-1 (5) 126:22,30;127:1,3,4 COX-2 (3) 125:28;126:26;127:4 creation (1) 187:22 **CREB1 (3)** 102:14.23.26 **CREB2**(1) 102:14 credentials (3) 183:20,22,24 **CREP1** (1) 94:7 **CREP2** (1) 94:7 crew (1) 167:3 criteria (1) 192:6 criticism (1) 188:21 critiques (1) 174:5 CROSS(1) 84:22 Crow (5) 81:19;82:16;84:5,14; 176:24 Cs (1) 169:27 culling (1) 172:25 current (9) 89:24:157:8:174:20; 179:25:180:3:182:14: 183:14,16;184:4

curve (1) 90:19 CuZnSOD (1) 103:4 cyclase (1) 94:5 cycle (2) 102:7:109:23 cyclic (1) 102:17 Cycline (2) 102:6,24 Cyclooxgenase (1) 125:28 cytokine (8) 119:2,2;120:8,19,20, 23,27;121:7 cytokines (11) 119:11;120:29,30; 121:4,15;162:10; 178:14,29,30;179:1; 187:6 D d/b/a (1) 81:12 daily (1) 141:8 dairy (12) 86:23:134:6:161:16. 24:162:16.18.19: 164:1;172:25;178:25; 185:11:189:18 Dakota (4) 81:27;91:7;194:2,8 damage (1) 121:2 data (44) 87:23:88:2.21:90:5: 134:19.24:138:10.25: 139:14;140:17;141:30; 142:2,15,19;148:9; 149:13;150:23,23; 154:30;155:2,3,27; 158:4;159:6;160:27; 164:30;173:17;174:4, 22;176:25,26;177:1,8, 12,13;179:29;180:6,22, 22,28;186:11;189:10; 190:22;191:24 date (5) 144:17:145:25; 149:27;169:15;193:28 dated (2) 135:25;153:17 Davis (1) 167:7 day (18) 81:27:134:4:144:16; 145:4.4.10.11.29.29: 148:12,14,14,15,17,17; 168:2;194:5,24

days (10) 88:4:90:8.14:135:25: 148:24:149:29:154:15. 15:170:15:171:8 day's (1) 91:4 day-to-day (1) 145:13 **DDF** (2) 145:2,4 deal (3) 120:2;132:8;162:17 death (3) 105:29;131:5,8 decade (1) 105:8 decide (1) 188:11 decided (5) 138:27;143:27,29; 168:16;170:3 decimal (2) 111:4:160:3 decision (1) 154:1 decrease (3) 109:7;110:13;162:21 Defendant (2) 82:11:83:16 defense (1) 163:17 define (1) 92:30 defined (1) 175:21 definitely (2) 101:29:192:4 definition (1) 103:23 definitive (1) 116:7 degree (5) 162:11,13,17; 185:18,22 degrees (4) 89:12;144:13;145:2, 3 deleterious (1) 121:4 deliver (1) 157:8 denoted (1) 179:16 **Department** (2) 85:28;168:11 departments (2) 86:3;175:2 dependent (1) 102:6 depends (2) 92:13:135:12 **Deposition** (18) 81:24,25;83:15,20;

85:5:91:28:92:8: 115:25:133:15:157:17: 164:14:165:2:175:7.8. 10:176:13:193:4:194:4 depressant (1) 155:14 describe (10) 85:7;86:6;88:4;96:5; 100:11;121:23;143:28; 156:23:184:23:190:1 described (5) 90:1:97:9:128:28; 176:21;178:7 describes (1) 168:25 describing (1) 133:16 description (9) 99:9;100:27;102:16; 107:21;118:25;119:4; 126:20;127:26;168:1 design (13) 136:21;137:12; 152:17,20;153:10; 156:5;166:25,28; 179:7,9,13;183:14; 189:30 designated (1) 174:9 designed (5) 85:21;113:16; 183:16.21.29 designing (2) 167:2;184:3 **Desmogelin** (2) 103:7.13 D-e-s-m-o-g-e-l-i-n (1) 103:19 **Desmosomes** (2) 103:24;104:1 D-e-s-m-o-s-o-m-e-s (1) 103:25 destroyed (1) 186:30 detail (2) 132:24;174:1 detailed (1) 141:25 details (1) 169:11 detect (2) 133:6:153:28 detected (2) 104:19;187:2 detecting (2) 133:10,16 determine (1) 86:22 determines (2) 188:3.5 determining (2) 161:30:183:28 develop (1)

Volume 2

86:9 developed (2) 86:11.12 development (1) 130:18 device (3) 183:14.21.24 dexamethasone (3) 154:8,14;155:14 difference (12) 139:30;140:5,6; 148:26;153:4;156:3; 184:20;191:10,14,17, 22:192:2 differences (4) 149:3;153:12; 171:16;180:21 different (47) 93:18,22;96:12; 97:19;101:2,15; 108:22;109:23;110:27; 114:1;117:2;120:25; 128:2;129:19;130:27; 136:18:137:26:138:1, 5,24;145:18;147:10,12, 15,16,24;148:8,16,20, 28;151:12,14;152:25, 29;154:19;155:7,7; 162:29;169:18;178:10; 187:10,28;189:13; 190:7;191:6;192:8,12 difficult (2) 174:27:178:12 difficulty (1) 172:7 digits (1) 146:29 directed (1) 150:6 directly (1) 86:29 disagree (1) 180:1 disagreed (1) 126:15 disclosures (1) 159:25 discovered (1) 111:17 discrepancies (1) 114:3 discuss (4) 140:21:160:14: 175:9,14 discussed (12) 86:24;113:2;116:30; 117:13;119:17;129:7; 140:19;146:30;156:7; 160:21;161:11;170:3 discussing (6) 85:5;112:4;138:13; 149:29:154:12:181:10 discussion (7)

140:23:157:27; 160:17.29:170:25.28: 182:10 discussions (3) 134:23:153:30: 165:11 disease (3) 104:10;119:19;185:3 diseases (3) 122:6,6;172:24 disk (10) 87:1,2,24;88:1;89:1; 156:30;157:9;159:3,4, dispute (1) 111:12 distinction (1) 116:30 distributed (2) 107:23;186:29 distribution (2) 105:30:131:13 **DISTRICT**(1) 81:15 divided (3) 89:28;114:21;115:3 dividing (1) 114:12 **DNA** (2) 132:30;186:22 doctor (4) 115:17:143:3:154:5: 178:20 doctorate (1) 167:10 document (21) 91:2:135:28:136:2.6; 139:21:143:13,14; 149:28;150:16;151:19; 155:20;157:1,14,18,26; 158:26;163:19,30; 166:9,11;169:12 documentation (1) 158:28 documents (9) 85:1;134:27,30; 135:22;138:6;158:20, 25,27;166:12 dominant (1) 108:27 done (30) 87:18:88:6.15.24.27: 89:5:104:28:105:11: 111:28;117:16;137:30; 138:12,13,25;139:1,7, 29;148:21,25;149:25; 165:21;167:14;171:3; 176:22,28;177:14; 183:18;185:19,24; 188:26 dose (3) 154:3.5.6 double (1)

Star Dichus, et al.,		1	1	May 7, 2014
125.00		104.00.105.10.02	······································	110 29 167 11
125:22	during (6)	184:28;185:18,23	epidemial (1)	110:28;167:11
double-check (2)	102:7;107:13;	electric (2)	103:26	exactly (9)
127:21;173:1	120:28;121:5;180:30;	172:18,23	epidemiological (2)	87:22;96:9;99:28;
Doug (7)	181:18	electrical (4)	172:14;173:5	114:14;126:2;146:3,
135:25;150:6;	DVM (1)	155:5;161:23;173:9;	epithelial (3)	27;172:4;174:11
153:16;155:18;168:16,	82:19	183:8	104:2,8,27	EXAMINATION (3)
22;170:2	02115	electricity (4)	epithelium (1)	84:22;176:4;182:25
Douglas (2)	Ε	183:9,11;184:4;	163:10	EXAMINATIONS (1)
85:13;140:21		187:15	equals (2)	83:1
down (12)	earlier (13)	elevated (3)	117:14;152:11	examining (1)
98:20;100:25;	85:13;86:8;88:12;	161:21,29;162:9	equipment (4)	137:7
101:30;110:6,15;	98:28;122:10;123:13;	elevation (1)	174:29;175:2;	example (16)
127:14;137:16;148:12;	129:7;148:4;152:28;	121:14	183:16;184:3	89:17;100:17;
163:20;165:22;169:23;	153:1;164:13;171:7;	else (9)	erroneous (1)	113:21;122:10;130:18;
170:19	175:1	91:18;110:9;111:30;	142:25	132:26;134:3;136:11;
Dr (61)	early (6)	112:7;155:30;157:2,3,	error (8)	137:16,19;142:20;
83:15,29;84:26;91:5;	100:18;158:23;	15;183:30	94:14;103:12;	143:15;163:2;187:6;
99:9,22;100:27;103:9;	165:4,7;171:13;186:8	else's (2)	142:24;144:7;146:13,	189:18;190:20
105:24;106:26;107:19,	easier (1)	112:5;142:8	16,21,25	EXCEL (1)
28;108:7;112:17;	135:20	e-mail (4)	errors (3)	88:2
113:2;115:22;116:16,	easiest (1)	169:23,26,29;170:30	88:19;142:24;145:7	except (3)
23;117:26,30;118:12;	143:27	embryonic (1)	Erwin (1)	121:30;127:27;193:6
123:22;124:2;125:3,	easy (3)	130:18	158:20	exclusively (2)
19,21;126:11,26;	98:26;122:23;163:14	employee (2)	escapes (1)	126:9;129:3
127:19,21;128:19;		167:11;168:12	183:13	
	Eau (1)	·		excreted (2)
129:1,13,22;130:24;	81:13	empty (4)	especially (1)	186:26,30
132:14,26;133:24;	EB (1)	96:16,23;97:2;	167:15	Excuse (7)
141:5,19;157:6;	129:20	132:29	Esquire (3)	86:2;105:24;107:7;
160:18;165:5,30;	editing (1)	end (8)	82:2,8,13	116:26;126:14;141:18;
167:2,9,11,23;169:18,	157:11	96:30;127:13;	Essentially (6)	162:12
24;173:29;174:3;	edits (1)	152:10;174:20;177:16;	90:11,18,20;97:18;	executed (1)
176:8,24;178:7;	157:13	190:22,23;191:14	119:15;151:2	194:22
179:23;180:10;182:29;	effect (59)	ended (1)	established (1)	EXHIBIT (71)
183:13;184:2,16	90:24,25;91:15;92:5,	183:12	148:7	82:25;84:29;86:25;
draft (3)	6,10,12,13,15,19,27;	Energy (3)	establishes (1)	88:29;89:15;90:6,27,
172:11,30;173:4	93:4,7,8,13,14,21,22,	81:12;82:11;170:4	177:20	28;91:9,23,30;94:14,
drafted (1)	24,26;94:3;99:12,23,	Engineer (2)	estimate (1)	17;96:29;98:8;100:28;
157:2	29;100:1,23,29;	167:12;183:8	160:30	105:17;107:5;112:17;
drafting (1)	101:19;104:14,15;	enjoyed (1)	et (4)	116:15,16,23;124:9,14,
164:5	105:25;107:18;127:6;	175:26	83:17,18;167:24;	24;128:26,27;131:3;
dramatic (1)	130:10;131:10;132:15;	enough (6)	173:7	135:22;138:16,18,19,
191:17	144:3,16,16,18;145:28,	149:21,26;153:15;	evaluate (2)	21;139:20;141:17,18;
draw (4)	28,29;146:5,8,17;	155:25;173:24;185:2	171:20,28	148:2,22;149:10,16,16;
174:23;180:29;	148:22;149:7;152:22,	enter (1)	even (17)	151:11;154:22,25;
185:17,21	23;154:18;173:19;	163:15	94:4;95:14;96:2,15,	155:17;156:2,29;
,				157:19;158:5;159:3;
drawn (1)	179:26;180:2,4;	entered (1)	16;100:21;104:12;	
109:25	182:14;185:6;186:11;	160:2	109:22;115:8;116:1;	160:6,20;164:14,15;
Drive (1)	189:23	entirely (2)	117:9;123:16;148:19;	165:27;167:23;171:6;
82:23	effects (21)	149:19;152:2	154:23;172:26;173:18;	172:11,20;173:26;
driving (1)	100:19,24;102:19;	entitled (2)	191:9	174:17,17;176:28;
91:4	105:23,30,30;121:4;	163:26;172:23	event (2)	178:6,7;180:23;
drugs (1)	122:13;140:18;143:10,	entries (1)	100:22;159:26	181:18,30;190:21,24;
125:30	23,26,26,27;144:5,5;	170:17	events (1)	191:4
duct (1)	145:4;146:12;185:29,	environment (1)	134:26	exhibited (1)
109:3	30;190:4	163:6	every- (1)	171:22
ducts (1)	effort (1)	environmental (2)	146:11	exhibits (3)
163:12	181:18	189:20,21	everyone (2)	142:3,4;179:16
duly (4)	either (18)	enzyme (6)	100:7;175:24	exist (2)
83:9;84:19;194:9,12	86:17;90:7;93:7;	101:22;125:7,14,25;	evidence (1)	130:3;143:5
dumb (1)	97:25;110:13;113:17;	127:25;128:2	184:27	expect (48)
189:5	120:13;131:9;134:12;	enzymes (4)	evidenced (1)	86:21;92:10,15,19,
duplicated (1)	143:26;147:4;159:27;	102:20;125:26;	194:22	27,30;93:5,6,12,17,18,
169:23	161:12;162:21;170:19;	132:16;178:23	exact (2)	26;94:2,24;95:7,8,16;
107.25	101.12,102.21,170.19,	152.10,170.25		20,7 1.2,2 r,75.7,0,10,

Volume 2

Star Blends, et al.,				May 9, 2014
96:6,13;97:9,24;98:3,4,	expression (24)	81:5	25	25;185:25
	86:10;89:26;95:9;	FAS (6)	finished (1)	formation (1)
6,9,14,27;99:1;101:18,	97:10;100:15,19;	105:18,19,21,25,28,	154:11	130:17
23;102:10;103:22; 104:14;106:2;107:9;	102:20,25,27;104:29;	30	firm (3)	forming (1)
112:24,27;113:15,22,	102:20,23,27,104:29, 105:7;110:2;125:15;	fashion (1)	82:8,13;83:20	130:5
	128:3,5,5;156:22;	99:17	62:8,15,85:20 first (51)	forms (3)
23;125:15;126:4;		FASLigand (4)	84:19;85:5;86:9;	
127:28;128:9;131:14; 133:1,2;163:17	160:15;164:26,30;			125:7;127:25;167:7 forth (8)
	174:5,16,28;186:14 expressions (1)	105:20,21,26;106:1 feasible (1)	89:16;92:8,25,26;	87:25;100:28;
expected (9) 93:6;98:1,19;103:15;	112:3	186:9	95:16;98:12,13;99:13; 100:4;103:22;107:4;	133:17;147:6;157:22;
104:15,16;107:18;	extent (4)	February (1)	115:25;116:2;133:15;	160:20;166:16;169:21
127:30;146:15	101:7,13;113:18;	149:27	134:14,19;135:15,20,	fortunately (1)
expecting (5)	184:19	feed (4)	26;138:11;140:27;	134:29
93:13,14,22,23;	extraordinary (1)	162:19;181:4,10;	141:6,23;143:16,18;	found (9)
145:23	111:14	182:4	147:23;149:5;151:22;	103:24,26;109:24;
expensive (2)	111.14	feedback (1)	152:9;153:5;154:5;	131:13;147:26;156:27;
174:27,28	F	164:22	157:17,23;165:2,28;	173:7,19;177:21
experience (2)		Feel (2)	175:7,12;176:13;	Foundation (10)
113:30;184:10	fact (7)	139:21:161:30	184:28;185:2;186:17,	120:12;121:27;
experiment (16)	135:3;139:13;	feeling (1)	19;187:19,20;188:29;	143:2;161:25;166:10,
111:15;112:2;	143:14;154:18;187:10;	176:1	189:17;190:9;194:12	21;168:6;174:7;
113:16;114:8;119:7;	189:24;191:25	felt (3)	five (1)	176:29;189:6
138:24;151:10;153:10;	factor (9)	122:6;168:22;184:17	128:14	four (15)
156:1,9,18,21,24;	94:28;107:22;	few (16)	Fixed (4)	87:25;106:18;
179:25;180:8;189:9	129:24,29;130:5,15;	84:28;88:3;92:22;	143:23,26,27;144:5	108:20;111:1,3,4;
experimental (3)	131:21,24;189:26	93:26;95:18;99:2;	flight (1)	132:23;146:29;154:14,
136:21;160:27;	factors (4)	104:9;113:14;127:24;	167:18	15;157:23;158:12,13,
166:27	129:27;130:3;	129:4,7;148:30;	fluctuates (1)	18;159:14
experiments (3)	161:29;188:5	176:10,22;177:3;	145:13	four-page (1)
111:16;144:4;172:9	fair (13)	184:14	fly (1)	86:25
expert (7)	92:3;93:9,29,30;	fidgeting (1)	113:13	Fourth (4)
84:18;91:24;99:16;	100:5;105:12;119:6;	182:6	Fold (5)	82:3;167:29;173:3,5
159:24,25;165:19;	128:17;149:9,26;	field (1)	89:25;111:5;119:8;	Frank (8)
174:9	153:15;162:18;173:24	178:16	160:11,11	159:16,23;173:29;
expertise (3)	fairly (17)	fifth (2)	folks (2)	176:21;179:23;180:18;
183:9,10,28	88:10;111:14,18;	110:24;190:25	122:19;165:28	182:17,21
explain (5)	122:23;127:4;131:12;	fight (1)	follow (1)	frankly (1)
132:29;163:8;	142:16;151:8,9;	187:23	145:19	130:22
186:13;187:18;189:4	154:13;162:23;167:30;	fighting (1)	followed (1)	free (1)
explanation (1)	172:3;188:13,14,30;	188:8	142:2	139:21
144:27	189:28 fall (3)	figure (1) 142:22	following (4)	freedom (4)
explanations (1) 173:10			83:9;109:7;134:11;	89:12;144:14;145:2, 3
exploded (1)	98:8,10;134:5	figuring (2) 157:7;184:3	137:4 follows (3)	5 frequently (2)
105:10	fallen (1) 169:21	-	84:20;145:17;193:6	116:17;120:28
exploding (1)	falling (3)	File (5) 84:6;136:18;156:28;	follow-up (6)	Friday (1)
105:8	99:7;184:16,18	159:12,14	85:22;86:8;108:6;	83:13
exposed (4)	falls (2)	files (2)	149:15,18;167:15	front (4)
89:24;109:14,14;	99:1;104:13	87:4;159:6	follow-ups (1)	85:1;90:6;141:15;
163:5	familiar (10)	final (4)	175:28	169:17
exposure (6)	120:10,23;121:13,	138:17;145:9,30;	foods (1)	frustrating (2)
86:22;93:3;161:23;	29;142:29,30;161:26;	189:14	109:6	175:18,23
173:9;174:20;181:1	167:7;179:6,29	find (15)	foregoing (1)	full (9)
expound (2)	familiarity (1)	93:25;94:10;96:2;	193:4	115:8;118:11;124:1,
109:29;125:4	122:11	104:3;122:23;124:15;	forget (1)	3,5,9,11,24;132:18
express (2)	far (6)	132:16;145:25;148:10;	133:13	function (29)
104:5;161:28	90:18,23;92:2;94:12;	154:30;156:28;170:9;	forgive (1)	86:16,18,21;91:18;
expressed (10)	114:2;158:30	173:24;178:12;179:4	103:17	93:4,16,29;102:4;
95:21;100:14;102:7;	farmer (1)	fine (4)	forgotten (1)	103:21;105:13;109:8,
107:12,13;129:3,5,8;	185:11	115:11;124:14;	120:7	26;110:7,14;112:22;
147:9;156:11	farming (1)	132:9;167:19	form (8)	116:24;125:12;126:5;
expressing (1)	134:6	finish (4)	94:29;119:20;149:9;	128:21;129:26,30;
89:26	Farms (1)	130:9;178:3;181:17,	158:26;164:26;166:20,	130:1;131:16;139:27;

Min-U-Script®

Metropolitan Court Reporters, Inc. (612) 333-7333 (7) expected - function

Volume 2

153:28;154:18;180:27; 167:14 geriots (1) 184:6.26 functional (1) 96:19 gets (3) 85:14 functions (2) 119:5;185:1 GI (3) funded (2) 85:8:156:1 gist (1)85:12 funding (1) 85:24 given (9) funneled (1) 85:30 fur (1) 170:6 gives (2) further (7) 90:25;111:24,28; giving (4) 112:7;141:24;142:1; 169:23 glance (2) G glanced (1) **GAD** (1) 142:5 97:28 gland (1) Galesville (2) 163:10 81:4.6 glandins (1) **GAP** (2) 127:5 94:7;106:2 glands (1) GAPDH (1) 162:29 96:20 **GLM (3)** gave (2) 113:28:159:12 Glu (2) 94:8.15 **GDK** (1) 95:12 Gel (1) 154:4Glucose (6) 170:4 gene (18) 86:10:89:26:95:20; 106:23,28 GlutPerox (1) 96:8,10,21;97:10,19; 105:7;110:8;156:22; 106:3 **GluTrans** (1) 159:7:160:15:164:25. 30;174:4,15,28 106:8 general (15) GluTransI (1) 85:12;86:17;101:22; 94:19 105:6;108:8;113:8; GluTransV (1) 118:4;119:4;121:23; 94:17 GMCSF(1) 140:20;142:15,16; 174:12;181:13;185:6 107:5 generally (4) goes (3) 112:4;113:4,18; 128:17 Good (13) generated (7) 87:15,17,18,27,30; 151:3:158:9 generating (2) gotta (1) 133:10;139:29 192:13 genes (10) 86:17;95:11;96:11, government (5) 12;100:12;101:1; 102:11,20;186:15; 187:3 graduate (1) gentleman (1) 167:10 134:13 graph (1) gentlemen (1) 156:27

greater (2) 144:15:191:1 gross (1) 151:7 90:24:186:29:192:9 grossly (1) 123:11 109:2,15;163:13 ground (2) 130:14:176:11 group (19)87:13:89:18:136:19, 89:9;91:19;113:8,14; 26,26;140:3,5,9,10; 173:15,27;189:8,17,17; 114:6:134:3:146:25; 150:20:194:17 191:8,9,13,21,21 groups (10) 155:3;178:21 88:23;110:29; 148:11;150:29;151:5; 116:7;144:26; 152:26;189:24;191:6, 145:27;170:3 22;192:12 growth (8) 95:16;103:22 94:28;100:18; 107:22;129:24,29; 130:3,5,15 guess (12) 94:6:96:3:105:6; 120:21;128:30;129:22; 132:7;136:30;148:19; 150:28;177:5;186:1 Η 143:10;145:17;147:5 H2(1) 125:24 glucocorticoids (1) Halderson (2) 81:3:83:17 half (2) 94:8,16,21,22; 115:14;168:18 halfway (1) 98:15 halved (1) 119:14 hand (4) 135:9;136:4;175:20; 194:24 hand-(1) 167:30 handled (1) 183:11 handling (1) 100:19,24;149:26 167:4 handwriting (9) 84:26,27,28;100:11; 136:5;141:17;142:7, 108:23.25:120:5: 8:151:21:152:1.4.4.6 132:26:139:4:161:18: handwritten (2) 177:20;178:22,24 151:20;190:26 happen (1) 121:11 happened (3) 134:3;177:12,15 85:25;134:20; 135:27;141:7;153:3 happening (1) 109:21 happens (1) 146:27 Haskins (7)

82:22,22;83:13,22, 23:84:3.15 HC (1) 112:13 head (12) 96:10;115:5;116:8; 122:22,25;129:11; 176:30;177:28,30; 178:4,8;189:30 health (12) 122:14;171:23,29; 172:1,4;179:26;180:2, 4,6;182:14;185:29,30 healthed (1) 122:24 health-ed (1) 122:26 heard (4) 134:7;161:28;162:3; 177:23 hearing (1) 154:26 hearsay (2) 91:24;162:4 heavily (1) 184:5 heavy (3) 112:13,15;161:8 held (1) 83:20 help (2) 139:23:170:4 helpful (2) 177:10.11 helps (1) 139:22 herd (4) 161:16,24;173:15,18 herds (3) 172:17;173:10,14 hereby (1) 193:3 Here's (1) 145:25 hereto (1) 194:20 Hexo (1) 94:27 Hexokinase (1) 94:27 HexoKinase1 (1) 107:7 high (6) 100:20;154:3,5,6; 161:17;178:28 higher (2) 90:3;185:1 highly (3) 111:22;179:27; 182:15 hip (1) 170:5 history (2)

142:21,26 hit (1) 192:13 hold (2)103:28.29 honestly (2) 160:4;165:8 hope (2)121:7,10 hormones (1) 123:3 hour (3) 115:14;140:24; 141:21 housekeeping (1) 96:21 HSP70 (1) 107:10 huge (1) 130:15 human (2) 105:6.7 humans (4) 86:12:105:13; 125:30:163:1 hundred (4) 111:5;114:7,8; 149:24 hungry (1) 162:13 hypo- (1) 146:19 hypocalcemia (1) 171:23 hypocalcemic (3) 170:23:171:4,12 hypothesis (2) 123:2,4 hypothetical (1) 160:28 hypothetically (1) 160:19

Ι

idea (7) 123:3;136:10; 151:21;159:10;174:12; 191:26;192:11 ideas (2) 85:23;187:29 identified (3) 91:25:99:17:159:24 identifying (2) 127:20;174:8 **IDS** (1) 82:9 Ig (1) 179:3 Ig3 (1) 177:23 IgA (29) 108:30;109:21;

Star Blends, et al.,	
110:28;112:27;142:7;	IL15 (1)
	123:27
147:16,23,28;148:13, 19;149:23;152:28,29;	
	IL16 (1)
161:8;162:21,25,27;	123:29
163:2,3;177:22;	IL1a (3)
178:30;185:7;190:21,	116:17,24;157:2
26,27;191:10,14;192:3,	IL1Alpha (3)
11	116:18;117:4;11
IgAHC (2)	IL1b (2)
112:10,29	116:28;157:29
IGF1 (1)	IL1beta (1)
107:22	118:4 H 1 B 22 (1)
IGF1R (1) 107:26	IL1Rec (1) 132:3
	152.5 IL2 (5)
IGF1Rb (2) 94:28;107:17	
94.28,107.17 IgG (7)	117:28;118:13; 160:24;161:7;17
108:22,29;163:1,4,4;	IL3 (2)
177:23;178:30	118:15;177:22
IgG1 (1) 108:21	IL4 (1) 118:17
IgG1HC (1)	IL6 (2)
107:30	118:19,23
IgG2 (1)	IL8 (4)
108:21	118:21,22,25,27
IgG2HC (1)	illo (1)
108:11	95:14
IgGJ (1)	imagine (1)
108:17	109:12
IgJ (17)	immediately (1)
108:14,18;109:7,24;	174:19
110:2,5,8,8,13,28;	immune (59)
111:25;112:24,25;	86:16,18,21;91:
114:17;115:10;117:9;	18;92:5;93:4,16
160:21	99:11,23,29;100
IgM (3)	21,28;101:27;10
108:23,24,26	10,22,29;104:20
ignore (1)	105:22,24,24;10
142:23	107:15;108:2,5;
IGR1R (1)	11,26;110:7,14,
94:29	119:18;125:9;12
II (2)	128:20;129:14;1
81:23;83:14	13,16;131:10,11
III (12)	16;132:14;139:2
141:19;154:8;155:3,	153:28;154:3,18
10;156:2;165:29;	155:14;177:21;1
171:15;174:4;179:25;	180:27;184:6
180:8;182:13;189:7	immunity (6)
IL (1)	109:1,16;110:11
179:1 U 1 (13)	162:22,26;163:5 immunoglobulin (
IL1 (13) 117:21;119:1,8,22;	108:3,22,23,26,2
122:17;137:20;138:15,	27;109:10;112:2
17,20;160:23;161:2;	178:27
177:22;178:30	Immunoglobulins
IL10 (8)	108:3,19,21;179
118:29;119:2,14,16;	immunological (4)
123:6;160:25;161:7;	105:13;112:22;
177:22	125:12;126:5
IL12Alpha (1)	Immunologists (1)
123:19	91:8
IL13 (1)	impact (1)
123:25	121:14

impacts (1) 173:9 impair (1) 110:6 impairment (1) ,24;157:29 110:14 implicated (1) 3:117:4:118:4 122:16 implication (1) 122:18 imply (2) 93:6:118:24 implying (1) 117:18 important (9) 93:2;108:4;109:3; ;161:7;177:22 120:30;130:13;162:23, 24,25;163:4 impossible (1) 95:6 inadequate (1) 185:5 inadvertently (1) 160:3 ,22,25,27 inappetence (3) 162:11,13,17 Inc (1) 81:12 incidents (4) 171:24,29;185:3,10 include (9) 86:16:97:2:108:19: 18,21:91:15, 115:15:128:1:139:11; 5;93:4,16,28; 140:18:146:12:190:4 included (6) 23,29;100:2,20, 101:27;102:3,4, 146:24;151:15; 29:104:20; 152:20,21,22;163:29 includes (1) 2,24,24;106:5; ;108:2,5;109:8, 108:8 110:7,14,16; including (7) ;125:9;127:6; 90:12;102:22; :129:14:130:10, 140:26;148:25;159:13; 31:10,11,12,15, 173:10:176:23 :14;139:27; incorrectly (1) 3;154:3,18; 160:2 ;177:21;178:26; increase (4) 101:23,24;157:30; 161:12 16;110:11; increased (1) 2,26;163:5 102:12 globulin (9) incredible (1) 22.23.26.27. 174:10:10;112:26; independent (2) 142:18;148:3 INDEX (1) globulins (4) 19,21;179:3 82:25 logical (4) indicate (7) 91:13;110:13;129:4; 151:23;152:16;183:27; logists (1) 192:6 indicated (11) 117:5;123:8;127:28; 153:1;168:14,21;

Volume 2

170:30;171:2;184:12; 186:3.3 indicates (8) 150:7;151:29;170:2; 171:8,15;174:18; 191:16:192:8 indicating (3) 110:15;153:16;162:8 indication (4) 136:28;138:6; 171:17;182:7 indications (1) 182:3 indicative (4) 91:14,17;130:7; 161:13 indicator (1) 183:27 individual (5) 92:26;143:10; 145:28;183:13,21 induced (1) 120:8 induces (1) 105:29 inducing (2) 107:14;120:30 INFalpha (1) 132:18 infection (5) 119:21:121:1.5; 161:14:162:1 infects (1) 163:16 inflammation (8) 120:28;121:8; 122:15:126:6,7,10; 127:6,8 inflammations (1) 122:8 inflammatory (3) 121:3,5;162:10 influence (1) 190:18 informa-(1) 135:30 information (4) 134:15;135:2;150:9, 10 inhibit (1) 130:1 inhibiting (1) 125:30 inhibition (1) 110:11 inhibitor (1) 117:23 initial (14) 88:22;104:22; 138:27;139:7;141:29; 151:15;152:20;174:23; 176:26;177:5,7,11; 183:7;191:29

initially (2) 88:20:192:3 initials (1) 168:4 injected (1) 154:14 input (2) 137:22;166:25 ins (1) 142:30 inside (1) 163:7 instance (5) 109:16;119:22; 169:1,2,8 insulin-like (3) 94:28;107:22;130:2 **Insurance** (1) 81:10 Int2 (1) 124:5 intake (1) 162:19 in-take (3) 181:4;182:4,5 **INTb1** (1) 124:1 integrity (1) 186:11 intended (2) 100:8:164:26 intensity (1) 133:17 interaction (3) 133:29:144:17; 145:29 interest (5) 91:3,4;153:12; 185:11.12 interested (5) 144:5,8,9;158:27; 194:20 interesting (5) 95:13;96:4,5;98:13; 128:28 interferon (3) 124:3,7;132:20 i-n-t-e-r-f-e-r-o-n (1) 124:3 interleukin (10) 132:3;136:12; 147:18.19:148:29: 160:22;161:12,22,29; 162:10 interleukins (3) 122:9,17;179:1 interpreted (1) 126:22 interrupt (1) 99:25 into (19) 84:2:98:10:99:1: 104:13;109:6;114:13;

Star Blends, et al.,				May 9, 2014
142.10.140.7 27.	101.9	102.1.2	least (17)	192.27
143:10;149:7,27;	101:8	103:1,2	least (17)	183:27
153:9;162:28;164:26;	Josie (2)	KREB2 (1)	84:10;90:28;97:10;	likely (12)
166:25;167:5;169:12;	168:22;169:3	102:27	98:20;101:19;116:22;	91:17;104:20;
172:4,7;191:23;192:9	Journal (2)	-	126:3;145:23,25;	105:22;106:5;107:25,
introduction (2)	163:30;172:21	L	152:3,9;165:21;169:1,	25;108:2;125:13;
152:10;155:26	jumped (2)		8;173:14;175:27;	161:21;164:9;173:11;
invade (1)	96:26;97:13	lab (2)	179:16	188:17
104:6	junctions (1)	133:10;167:5	leave (1)	limb (1)
involve (1)	103:25	labeled (5)	132:28	130:17
135:20	June (1)	94:7;124:1;125:21;	leaving (1)	limitation (1)
involved (28)	135:25	139:27;159:14	109:21	109:18
85:6;86:4;95:19;		laboratory (1)	left (4)	line (12)
104:6;108:30;112:3,	Κ	181:28	105:16;106:22;	85:18;139:30;
26;125:8,25;126:6;		lack (2)	146:13,17	146:19,24;152:11,14,
127:5;130:15,16,17,19;	Kasper (3)	183:24,28	lefthand (2)	15;168:18;170:2;
131:5,7;138:9;157:7;	168:8,8;169:24	lactation (4)	107:4;124:8	172:14;173:5;193:7
165:15,17,18;168:9;	Kasper's (1)	150:17;151:8;	leg (2)	linear (2)
181:24,27,27;184:5,9	170:30	170:27;171:14	175:7,12	142:15,17
involving (2)		lactose (1)	LeMire (11)	lined (1)
	Kathleen (1) 158:20	124:11	134:13;135:24;	163:10
85:6;156:21				
isoform (1)	keep (1)	lapping (2)	136:24;139:13;140:21;	lines (7)
97:17	141:8	181:20;182:5	150:6;153:15;155:18,	100:6;114:16;
isomer (2)	KENNEDY (1)	large (2)	30;156:7,14	158:12,13,18;159:14;
132:12,12	82:14	163:4;188:30	length (4)	181:22
issue (4)	kept (1)	larger (2)	98:13;125:5;171:17;	lining (5)
155:11,12;162:19;	120:24	111:20;173:15	189:3	104:8;109:2,13,15;
174:14	key (2)	last (38)	lengthy (1)	163:13
issues (3)	109:16;122:26	84:30;87:9,16,25;	134:30	list (6)
174:5;186:4,6	kicking (1)	89:30;91:27;95:4;	Leptin (3)	92:28;100:26;
item (45)	181:21	96:29;98:12,30;99:2;	94:30;95:2;124:22	101:30;116:17;119:25;
99:22;103:3;105:16;	Kin (1)	105:8,10;113:2,29;	less (13)	128:22
106:5;107:4,26;	94:27	114:29;119:17;132:23;	91:3;107:25;109:10;	listed (1)
110:21;116:16,28;	Kinase (4)	136:22;137:19;138:9,	111:5;112:25,29;	130:28
117:21,28;118:10,17,	94:6;98:23;102:7;	18,29;140:19;146:19,	114:6;121:16;123:14;	listening (1)
21,29;123:15,19,25;	127:25	22;157:17;158:12,13,	155:15;157:30;158:1;	175:26
124:1,2,5,8,22,24,27;	kind (14)	18;163:8;165:15;	162:23	literature (4)
125:1,3,16,21,29;	96:1;104:12;107:14;	166:14;167:6;168:7;	leukocytes (2)	120:15,16;121:30;
126:4,11;127:23;	109:28;111:8;112:8;	172:13;173:27;184:19	129:8,10	162:14
128:8,27;129:16;	122:26;135:1;140:17;	late (3)	level (18)	litiga- (1)
130:7,20;131:2,18,24,	175:18;176:1,10;	134:11;158:22;165:4	90:3;95:9;100:14,15,	173:28
29;132:1,19;157:9	184:16;185:30	later (11)	19;122:2,8;128:4,4,5;	litigation (6)
items (4)	kinds (3)	84:11;85:4;149:17,	139:30;179:27;182:15;	91:25;165:6,16,17,
96:27;125:29;	87:3;109:14;150:18	26;153:6,6;159:4;	185:1;186:14;187:7,8;	18;174:10
132:23;141:1	Kirby (4)	177:12,15;189:12,13	188:4	little (21)
IV (10)	81:26;91:5;133:18;	LAW (2)	levels (24)	86:24;91:27;96:26;
94:15,18;106:9,10,	193:5	82:3;83:20	95:22;102:27;	97:14;104:24;109:29;
11,15,18,24,25,28	Klebella (3)	Lawrence (16)	104:16;119:11,14;	110:30;113:4;114:6;
	96:7,9;97:2	82:2,2;83:3,27,28;	121:15;156:4;161:17;	118:5;121:16;122:1;
J	knew (5)	84:1,9,11,24;101:11,	162:25;177:20,21;	130:26;135:9;137:26;
	153:27;165:9,13;	16;176:29;185:25;	178:22,27;180:2;	140:19;147:22;152:2;
January (4)	166:5;185:15	189:3,6;190:20	185:1,12,27,28;186:17,	162:29;163:8;185:6
167:26;169:15;	knowing (3)	lawyers (1)	17;188:19;191:10,15;	LLC (3)
170:10;190:7	133:26,27;191:22	175:21	192:11	81:5,8;83:18
Jeremy (1)	knowledge (7)	layout (1)	LEWIS (9)	LLP (1)
176:15	104:29;105:6;	159:7	81:24;83:16;84:17;	82:14
Jerry (2)	111:23,26,29;112:1;	LC (1)	141:19;168:17,22;	local (2)
168:19;170:2	164:19	172:21	170:2;193:3;194:5	162:22,25
job (1)	known (11)	lead (2)	Ligand (1)	logs (1)
112:4	86:4;95:30;104:25;	104:9;172:26	106:1	136:18
John (5)	105:11;130:2;155:14;	leading (1)	Light (6)	long (12)
81:26;88:7;103:14;	165:12;178:8,17;	122:20	81:19;82:17;84:5;	84:30;85:9;91:5;
114:25;193:5	189:28;194:4	learned (1)	133:10,16,21	134:22,29;135:12;
···· (1)	KREB1 (2)	90:17	lights (1)	142:21;159:17;164:24;
join (1)	KKEDI (2)	90.17	ingines (1)	112.21,139.17,101.21,

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

Star Dienus, et al.,		1		May 9, 2014
167.20.169.20.175.2	homen ha areta a (C)	192,17.21		
167:30;168:30;175:3	lymphocytes (6)	182:17,21	measured (8)	middle (3)
long-term (2)	96:1;104:5,7,25,29;	massive (3)	180:25;181:5,6,19;	145:22;168:14;
121:14;122:14	105:5	120:28;121:3,7	182:7;186:27;188:15,	174:17
look (41)	lymphocyto (2)	mast (1)	20	mid-lactation (1)
87:14,17,27;89:3,7,	96:11,12	92:6	measurement (2)	171:11
26;90:29;91:8;95:25;	Lyn (1)	mastitis (2)	93:15,23	might (42)
103:23;114:15;115:27;	81:3	173:7;185:10	measurements (5)	86:15,17,18,19;
122:22;123:5;124:13;		materials (9)	85:6;113:22;119:7;	92:12,12;93:8,17;
128:22;129:12;130:26;	Μ	86:27;134:10;137:5;	154:16;167:25	100:21;101:22,23;
135:3,5,14;137:11;		156:26,27;165:30;	measures (6)	102:12;105:4;106:19,
138:1,2;139:21;140:3,	machine (2)	166:12;169:19;173:28	86:23:179:6,9,13;	20;107:13;112:27;
5;141:21;142:3,9;	133:10,16	math (1)	180:6;181:12	114:1;115:28;116:10;
148:8;149:3;152:4,6;	Madison (5)	159:27	measuring (7)	122:14;125:14;129:8;
155:24;157:21;158:14;	81:28;83:21;86:29;	mathematically (1)	184:6,30;186:16,17;	131:15;135:9,13,14,19;
167:28;169:5,27;	133:26;194:6	111:10	187:10;188:27;189:1	137:10;138:13;139:11;
170:14	Mahler (1)	mathematics (3)	mechanically (1)	140:18;149:11;153:14;
			90:4	
looked (9)	176:15	88:28;89:14;190:1		178:28;179:4,5;181:2;
87:22;90:15;109:18;	main (2)	matter (9)	MEDIA (2)	185:7;189:18,21;
121:30;147:23;151:8;	127:7;161:16	83:17;84:3,4,18;	82:22;83:23	190:18
181:14;183:22;188:16	major (9)	115:26;159:21,27;	mediated (1)	milk (10)
looking (21)	102:4;108:20;110:5;	175:7;194:20	122:14	150:16;151:8;
85:23;89:11;98:23;	112:27;161:19;162:27;	May (32)	mediating (1)	161:17;162:30;163:2,
110:2;111:16,18;	163:2;180:26,26	81:28;83:13;84:11;	127:7	3,11,18;171:8;185:10
118:6;124:17;145:24,	makes (4)	86:4;87:20,24;91:21;	Medical (1)	milliamp (4)
26;146:23;148:24;	101:14;126:26;	92:30;97:15,23;98:10,	134:4	179:25;180:3;181:1;
149:19;150:28;154:23;	154:28;171:17	17,28;105:3;126:22;	medicine (2)	182:14
158:9;170:27;183:5;	making (6)	133:27;134:1;139:23;	133:25;172:22	milliliter (1)
184:5;185:4;191:4	101:9;113:8;153:22;	152:3;157:13,14;	memo (5)	136:12
looks (17)	163:25;187:19,20	160:3;165:11,12,24;	135:24;150:6;	mind (4)
87:10,23;89:8;95:23;	mammary (4)	169:1;173:11;175:28;	153:15;155:17;169:13	91:26;99:30;106:27;
112:21;118:5,22,25;	96:7;109:3;162:29;	184:17;190:7;194:5,24	memories (1)	116:13
123:18;129:20;137:14;	163:10	maybe (15)	85:19	mine (5)
147:18;150:2,4;152:2,	manner (2)	90:28;100:23;	memos (5)	136:9;142:9,9;152:2;
8;155:4	115:11;154:20	104:24;113:12,21,23;	134:12;140:25;	176:23
lose (1)	many (20)	119:28;122:7;127:27;	141:6,15;142:1	minimal (1)
177:1	90:7,16,17;92:24;	128:17,18;130:21;	ment (1)	117:1
lost (2)	100:23;102:20,20,21,	156:28;158:8;163:24	123:17	Minitab (2)
176:25;177:8	30;108:19;113:9;	mean (23)	mentioned (5)	88:6;90:12
lot (15)	119:5;121:2;125:7,9;	89:17,18,22,28,28;	98:18,28;109:12;	M-i-n-i-t-a-b (1)
85:14;101:2,5;	129:27;135:13;147:9;	90:2,19;91:10;92:30;	152:28;175:1	88:8
102:25;104:25;105:11;	162:27;187:1	110:10;120:21;128:5;	ments (1)	Minneapolis (1)
119:5;130:12,14;	March (2)	137:21;145:23;150:20;	85:15	82:9
135:1;139:9;158:15;	157:18;176:18	163:9;170:25;172:1;	Messenger (24)	MINNESOTA (19)
163:17;184:6;188:14	Mark (7)	175:11;184:24;185:9;	85:6;102:19,21;	81:15,27;82:10,16,
lousy (1)	82:22;83:22;88:29;	186:15;190:17	112:3;156:22;178:11;	23;83:24;84:2,7;
161:30	95:29;140:24,30;159:4	meaning (2)	185:1,27;186:16,21,23;	134:20;135:26;139:20;
low (9)	mark@haskinsmediaservicescom (1)	91:12;118:24	187:2,7,13,15,17,18,27,	141:7;147:11;153:3;
86:22;100:14;	82:24	means (21)	29;188:1,3,4,8,27	156:1;159:17;182:1;
104:16;111:14;122:8;	MARKED (10)	87:10,25;88:13,19;	Messengers (1)	194:1,8
145:10;161:4;171:24;	82:26;90:27;138:18;	90:5;100:1;112:13;	188:14	minus (20)
178:28	142:3;157:18;159:3;	133:8,9;137:29;138:2;	met (1)	110:24;111:1;
lower (5)	164:13;167:23;172:20;	144:30;145:23,25;	134:1	114:19;115:4,6,7;
110:29;111:9;	173:27	146:15,20,20;148:14,	meter (1)	117:6,7,10,15;118:8;
119:16;122:1;137:17	market (1)	14;163:14;192:9	167:24	123:8,14;158:6,7;
lowered (1)	126:1	meant (5)	method (3)	160:22,23,24,24,25
109:11	marks (1)	99:29;120:25;	142:28;149:10;179:6	minute (1)
lunch (5)	151:25	133:18;160:4;189:22	methods (6)	85:2
135:4;140:24,26,27;	Martin (7)	measurable (1)	134:6;142:14,23;	minutes (2)
141:21	159:16,23;173:29;	93:4	174:3,6;182:21	90:29;167:17
lungs (2)	176:21,25;179:23;	measure (3)	mice (1)	misinterpreting (1)
109:2,13	180:10	142:20;180:27;185:3	86:13	126:23
lymphocyte (1)	Martin's (4)	measure- (1)	micrograms (1)	miss (3)
95:19	174:3;180:18;	85:14	136:12	97:5;98:15,15

Volume 2

Star Dichus, et al.,	1	T		111ay 7, 2014
missed (2)	morning (10)	145:3	110:24	objection (15)
119:28;179:21	84:12,26,27;90:27,	near (3)	notations (2)	99:25;101:14,15;
misspell (1)	30;115:16;151:16;	95:4;103:11;128:26	136:5;170:15	120:12;121:26;122:29;
103:16	158:5;160:21;169:9	neat (1)	note (3)	143:2;161:25;162:2,4;
mistaken (3)	Most (17)	152:5	83:25;168:15;169:16	166:21,23;168:6;
105:3;140:2;151:4	90:11;94:21;101:3;	necessarily (4)	noted (3)	174:7,8
Misty (1)	102:9;108:28;116:22;	110:10;137:27;	98:14;146:3;171:16	objections (3)
167:6	121:30;132:16;134:4;	170:11;187:26	notes (12)	101:8,9,12
misunderstood (1)	140:12;143:14;147:5,	necessary (1)	97:20;141:8,11;	objective (4)
144:25	7;162:30;163:1;167:2;	109:5	144:26;165:28;166:3,	86:9,14;161:16,19
Mix (4)	172:3	necrosis (2)	5;167:24,28;170:9,9;	objects (1)
143:1;146:30;	mostly (1)	131:21,24	181:14	101:8
179:12,14	181:27	need (9)	Notice (3)	Observation (1)
mixed (12)	Moving (1)	99:20;104:7;128:18;	81:25;86:19;146:5	148:13
142:29;143:9,18,18,	118:15	135:14;159:4;160:29;	noticed (1)	observations (1)
24,24,24;147:4,7,28,	MRNA (4)	161:3;163:21;184:8	84:4	142:18
29;148:30	128:6;157:29;	needs (2)	noting (1)	observed (1)
mixture (1)	164:25;174:4	148:11;185:24	193:7	187:26
186:28	much (24)	negative (1)	NSP (1)	obtained (1)
mmp1 (2)	87:11,14;89:27;	96:8	83:30	180:28
95:5;124:24	92:17;95:17,30;104:3;	neither (3) 02:16:06:3:174:0	NSP/Xcel (1) 82:11	obtaining (1) 158:27
mmp3 (1) 124:27	105:22;111:9;119:22; 120:14,24;125:25;	92:16;96:3;174:9 nescence (1)	82:11 nuances (2)	obviously (5)
mmp9 (1)	120.14,24,125.25, 133:4,4;137:5;148:22;	145:18	175:25,26	91:21;92:1;105:6;
124:29	152:22,24;162:20;	next (61)	nucleus (1)	127:20;136:3
mobility (1)	181:26;187:30;188:5;	95:10;97:16,20,28;	186:22	occasion (6)
170:21	189:1	99:21;100:26;101:6,	Number (38)	140:21;142:12;
model (13)	mucosal (7)	18;103:3,3,6;105:16,	83:15,19;84:6;90:2,	160:14;173:26;175:9,
86:13;143:18,25;	109:1,1,11,16,20;	18;106:8;107:4,7,10,	10,25;110:28;114:12,	14
145:17;146:12,12,30;	110:11;162:27	17,26;108:11;112:10;	17;123:13;133:4;	occasions (2)
147:4,5,28;148:30;	multi- (1)	116:16,28;117:21,28;	134:12;136:14;137:16,	133:15;170:19
190:3,5	149:20	118:10,15,17,19,21,29;	18;138:15,15,16,20;	occur (1)
models (4)	multiple (7)	123:19,25,27;124:1,5,	142:1;146:27;151:3,8;	126:8
142:15,17;143:15;	136:22;152:26;	8,22,24,27;125:1,3,16,	154:13;159:10,12,23,	occurred (2)
147:4	170:15,17,19;183:4;	21;126:11;127:23,24;	23;160:11,11;166:11,	134:26;175:11
modified (2)	184:10	128:8,12,27;129:16,18;	13;167:28;168:1;	occurs (2)
129:30;161:3	multiplication (1)	130:20;131:18,24,29;	169:14;171:21;188:30;	104:10;171:13
molecule (1)	115:5	132:1,7;138:13;	193:7	o'clock (1)
112:27	Must (1)	148:30;163:19	numbers (21)	192:15
moment (7)	155:24	nobody (3)	87:17,18;89:16;	off (21)
89:3;97:8;115:13,23;	myself (2)	112:7;156:11;183:30	94:16;135:1;136:30;	86:26;96:10;116:8;
123:6;134:17;146:4	158:26;194:16	none (2)	137:2,18;139:16,19;	122:22,24;126:1;
moments (3) 84:28;99:3;177:3	Ν	98:8;185:14 non-statistician (1)	150:3;151:20,27; 158:10,11,15,16,17;	129:11;140:30;148:16; 152:28;156:29;157:9;
money (3)		140:16	159:18;172:7;178:28	160:3;165:29;170:6;
174:26;177:4,4	name (17)	noon (1)	numeral (4)	177:27,30;178:3,8;
month (1)	83:22;87:2;99:7;	141:3	94:8;106:9,10;	189:30;192:13
116:9	118:11;124:1,3,5,9,11;	nor (1)	132:11	OFFICE (3)
months (1)	125:27;126:27;132:18;	194:20	nuts (1)	82:3;86:30;115:24
149:26	133:28;167:6;168:7;	normal (3)	91:5	often (10)
more (33)	183:13;184:14	121:2;171:11;177:26	NW (1)	88:24;111:18;
86:6;91:17;92:2;	named (2)	normally (2)	82:14	122:30;126:9;128:4;
104:24;105:22;109:29;	159:6;167:6	100:14;171:13		131:12;143:25;175:22;
110:30;112:25;125:15;	names (3)	Norman (4)	0	187:4,20
129:22;130:26;131:12;	122:24;125:27;	84:5;176:16,23;		Oftentimes (1)
140:14,18;149:12,15;	136:18	179:24	oath (2)	111:16
155:19;163:1,8;	natural (1)	Northern (1)	84:20;194:10	ointment (1)
169:11;172:6,6,12;	136:18	83:16	obesity (1)	170:5
173:11;175:21;177:5,	nature (2)	Nos(1)	122:13	old (2)
13,16;185:12,19,24;	113:8;168:26	81:3 Natary (2)	object (9)	85:19;150:17
187:7;189:2	Nazianz (1)	Notary (2) 81:26;194:7	86:8;91:23;99:15;	Oltenacu (1) 173:6
MORGAN (1) 82:9	82:4 NDF (1)	81:26;194:7 notation (1)	116:4;159:22;166:9;	O-l-t-e-n-a-c-u (1)
02.7	NDF (1)		176:29;185:25;189:6	0-1-1-v-11-a-v-u (1)

Metropolitan Court Reporters, Inc. (612) 333-7333 (12) missed - O-l-t-e-n-a-c-u

Star Dienas, et al.,				1111 y 3, 201
172:27	135:10;141:20	page (59)	passes (1)	96:18;97:2
once (1)	opposed (3)	94:11;95:3,4;96:6,	121:8	PGSH2 (7)
189:9	91:18;93:18;185:12	29;98:8,12;120:1,4;	past (2)	125:21;126:16,17,
one (145)	Oral (1)	124:8,16;128:26,27;	87:7;91:7	27;127:1,3,20
85:4;87:4,26;90:4;	170:4	131:19;137:19,19;	pathogens (1)	ph (2)
92:2,10,12,14,26;	order (2)	138:19;139:27;143:15,	109:15	96:11,19
94:10,12,23,24;95:13,	135:19;158:6	21,22,22,22;144:11,13;	pathways (1)	PhD (3)
30;96:10,14,20;97:9,	ordinarily (1)	145:22,26;146:6,8;	125:8	81:24;84:17;133:25
20,23,28;98:12,13,17,	126:5	147:27,30;148:1,10,12;	pattern (1)	phone (2)
18,18,27,30;99:21;	organism (2)	150:4,8;151:19;152:1,	130:17	84:11;115:23
100:18,26,27;101:4,6,	121:13;184:26	14,15;154:22,25;155:3,	Paul (3)	phospholipase (2)
18,21;103:22;104:13;	original (7)	10;157:25;167:27,30;	82:13;83:17;84:13	125:6,7
105:18;106:2;107:4,7,	87:21;147:10;	168:14,21;169:16;	pcarlson@kcvblawcom (1)	Photon (1)
9,10,17,18;108:11,16;	149:12;153:1;154:7,	172:13,14;173:3,3;	82:15	133:20
109:10;110:5;111:20;	20,21	174:17;191:4,4;193:7;	PCGDSynth (1)	photons (1)
112:2,24;113:13,20;	originally (1)	194:22	127:14	133:19
114:9,17;115:8,12;	148:2	pages (10)	peer (4)	physics (1)
117:12,18,18;119:4,8;	others (10)	90:16;137:4,7,16;	164:19,22;188:21,24	173:29
121:7,10;122:2;	97:5;100:12;119:23,	147:26;149:1;157:23;	Peggy (2)	piece (4)
123:16,27;124:28;	24;132:27;135:18;	166:14;169:12,13	84:4;176:16	88:24;109:4,5;161:9
125:5,6,27,29,30; 128:3,3,9,12,18,28;	156:8;158:26;169:24; 177:28	paper (22) 135:26;149:12;	Penn- (1) 163:27	pim1 (3) 126:11;127:15,22
129:12;130:13;132:10,	ought (1)	153.20,149.12, 154:20,21,24;156:2;	people (6)	Pinckney (1)
10,11;133:13,24;134:8,	84:1	160:29;162:20;163:29;	147:7;161:28;175:1;	81:28
9,19;135:15,18,20;	out (27)	164:4,11,13,19;165:29;	181:26;184:8,15	PK (2)
139:6,18;140:9,9;	85:24;90:18;95:18;	171:15;172:11;173:3,	per (3)	129:13;132:6
141:6;142:15,19,20;	96:12;103:9;104:4;	4,21,24;186:3;188:11	136:12,19;189:14	PKA (4)
143:5,6,6;145:4;147:4,	106:22;110:19;118:5;	paragraph (3)	percent (1)	97:23;98:23;127:24;
17,23;151:14;152:9;	124:24;134:16;142:22;	139:26;157:28;170:1	149:24	132:12
153:9,9,20,25;155:12;	156:27;157:7;162:28;	parallel (2)	perfect (1)	PKAbCat (2)
156:1,24,27;157:27;	164:19;169:18;172:4,	112:25;187:4	188:9	97:24;127:23
159:23;161:17,20,29;	6,21;173:25;174:26;	part (20)	perfectly (1)	PKACAlpha (3)
162:9;164:17;166:14;	177:4;184:3,16,18;	85:13;86:18,18;	187:29	95:11,11;97:21
169:1,8;171:26,27;	190:20	112:27;141:19;144:26;	perform (2)	PKACDelta (1)
172:12,13;173:14,15;	outbreak (1)	154:8;156:2,15;160:6;	117:12;174:27	95:11
178:4;180:24;181:2;	119:20	163:5;165:29;171:15;	performance (2)	PKAR2Alpha (1)
183:19;184:11;187:3,	outcome (1)	174:4;179:25;180:8;	172:25;190:6	98:17
11,12;188:5	194:20	182:13;184:7;189:7;	performed (4)	PKARI (1)
ones (7)	output (2)	190:5	105:1,3;138:7,25	132:11
92:28;94:1,2;99:7;	141:6;143:20	participate (2)	perhaps (7)	PKARIIb (1)
178:1;179:3,17	outs (1)	183:30;184:2	93:25;95:29;104:13;	97:27 PKC (1)
one-time (1) 168:11	143:1 outside (4)	participation (1) 171:9	115:17;119:23;141:15; 172:12	PKC (1) 132:12
online (1)	109:13;163:7,12,14	particle (1)	period (1)	PKCalpha (4)
90:7	over (13)	133:22	174:21	95:12;97:27;127:27;
only (9)	97:23;105:8;115:23;	particular (23)	permit (1)	128:1
96:7;138:26;155:12;	116:9;134:5,5;136:14;	88:21;89:9;92:6;	91:22	PKCDelta (1)
166:22;171:3;175:8;	141:21;146:13,17;	108:16;110:1,21;	peroxidase (1)	98:14
184:11;188:23;191:20	151:22;172:15;176:10	111:24;112:6;129:10;	124:11	PKG1Alpha (1)
opened (1)	overall (5)	136:2;139:26;147:17;	person (6)	98:1
88:2	110:14;156:17,23;	148:23;149:4;155:1;	133:27;156:17,17,	PKG1beta (2)
opine (1)	184:25;185:29	157:9;158:17;159:13;	23;166:27;167:6	95:12;98:1
182:20	overseeing (1)	169:2;170:25;174:25;	personally (1)	PKs (2)
opined (1)	156:17	181:9;183:9	164:29	128:8,8
179:23	own (1)	particularly (4)	Peterson (2)	place (1)
opinion (9)	173:18	86:11;129:14;	82:19;83:29	172:12
91:13,19,24;99:16;		135:29;157:7	PGD (2)	places (5)
101:12;140:15;161:20;	Р	parties (1)	125:26;126:21	126:8;129:5;130:12;
162:5;179:30	DA (1)	194:19	PGDSynth (1)	131:14;152:3
opinions (3)	P2 (1)	Pascal (1)	125:16 BCDS-mthase (2)	Plaintiffs (5)
175:13;176:19;	129:25	172:26	PGDSynthase (2)	81:7,18;82:6;83:27;
185:22	packet (1)	pass (1) 133:24	126:30;127:3 pGEM (2)	84:9 plasmin (1)
opportunity (2)	167:23	133.24		hiamm (1)

Volume 2

138:18:147:11;

96:18 play (1) 93:28 plays (1) 109:16 **PLC (3)** 95:7;97:9;125:1 **PLCa** (5) 95:7;97:16,17;125:3, 6 pleasantries (1) 175:16 please (20) 83:25;84:2;85:8; 88:29:90:22:93:1; 94:26;102:1;103:17; Pr (1) 121:24,28;123:1; 124:20;125:5,23; 126:29;131:2,3;163:8; 189:4 pleasure (1) 167:17 plenty (1) 135:3 plot (2) 151:25;152:4 plus (3) 96:14;137:18;157:23 pm (1) 192:15 pneumonia (1) 96:9 PO (2) 82:3.15 point (13) 111:4;134:2;144:22, 23,24;151:30;154:12; 160:3;168:15;177:27; 179:4;188:1,10 pointed (1) 190:20 points (3) 122:5;149:5,5 pool (1) 89:11 poorly (1) 86:11 population (1) 171:30 portion (4) 92:8;136:3;157:17; 176:13 positive (5) 130:4;153:26; 154:28;155:23,26 possibilities (3) 99:30;110:4,5 possibility (2) 130:8;191:28 possible (11) 93:23:109:20:137:7: 152:23:153:22:170:26: 173:10;185:20;187:3;

188:21:189:1 possibly (4) 105:20:139:10: 164:4:169:3 post (1) 167:10 post-it (1) 144:26 potential (3) 86:23;142:24;185:11 potentially (1) 109:14 Power (6) 81:19;82:17;83:17; 84:5,14;176:24 144:15 practical (1) 172:9 PRASG (1) 128:9 preceding (1) 194:22 prefer (2) 132:8;174:18 preparation (1) 122:1 prepared (2) 173:28;184:13 prescribed (1) 170:22 PRESENT (10) 82:18:83:28:95:14: 96:7.19:101:2:102:9: 105:4,28:130:11 presentation (1) 163:26 president (1) 91:7 press (1) 163:30 pretty (4) 126:7;137:5;150:10; 152:8 prevent (1) 191:26 **Preventive (1)** 172:21 previous (1) 85:22 **PREVIOUSLY** (1) 82:26 priate (1) 140:13 primarily (1) 156:14 principal (1) 161:29 printed (2) 86:26;156:29 printout (2) 137:2:138:3 printouts (1)

151:26 prior (2) 146:4:174:19 probably (21) 87:1:90:15:92:22: 99:5;102:13,24; 108:29;109:30;113:10, 26;116:20;120:10; 122:28;125:11;141:25; 151:1;154:15;162:16; 169:3;178:27;184:15 probe (3) 108:23,26:132:30 problem (3) 142:16:172:2,5 problems (9) 93:10;113:20;169:6; 171:23,29;173:8,11; 186:7,10 **Proc** (8) 142:28;143:1,9,10, 24;147:7;179:12,14 P-r-o-c (1) 142:29 procedure (4) 114:11;143:4,18; 147:8 proceed (1) 106:3 **Proceeding** (2) 112:10:128:26 proceedings (1) 83:9 process (6) 121:20,21;150:24; 171:4;186:23;188:18 processed (1) 186:26 processes (3) 104:10;130:16;131:5 produce (2) 161:17:186:24 produced (5) 99:17;122:10; 135:23;159:9;163:11 produces (1) 123:3 producing (6) 109:10,21,22;110:7; 186:19;188:29 production (10) 110:6.14:121:3: 150:17:161:17:162:19: 185:10:186:21:188:7; 190:13 productivity (1) 161:24 professional (2) 133:29;162:5 professor (18) 91:6.26.29:135:23; 137:5:140:26:156:8. 18,20,28,29;157:10;

159:15,16:160:16; 163:25:173:30:175:26 program (10) 88:6,10,13,18;131:7; 137:3,6,22;146:25; 151:2 programs (2) 90:11:146:11 pro-inflammatory (3) 119:1;120:29;178:14 project (3) 85:20;165:29,29 proliferate (2) 102:9,12 proliferated (1) 102:8 proliferation (1) 95:19 promoting (1) 100:18 pronounce (2) 124:9;172:26 pronounced (3) 117:22,24,25 pronunciation (1) 173:6 properly (3) 183:25,26,29 proposals (1) 85:16 **Prostaglandin (3)** 125:16.24.25 protection (1) 109:17 protective (1) 121:1 protein (30) 98:23:102:23,30; 103:12,21;107:12,16; 110:2;127:25;129:25; 130:5,6;178:10; 185:28;186:18,19,25, 26,28;187:2,8,13,30; 188:2,4,6,8,19;190:13; 191:6 proteins (11) 94:22;102:3;129:28, 28;130:15;131:5; 186:25;187:22,26; 188:29;189:1 protons (1) 133:18 provide (1) 135:6 provided (8) 86:28,30;134:10; 147:11;158:26;159:2; 165:30;174:9 Ps (2) 152:9:161:4 Public (2) 81:26:194:7 publication (5)

161:1:164:6.27 publications (1) 162:8 publish (1) 188:17 published (7) 134:21:139:19; 153:2,2;164:12; 172:11:188:13 publishing (1) 188:12 pulled (1) 126:1 purpose (4) 121:8;166:19; 180:26,27 pursuant (3) 81:25;153:13;160:20 put (12) 84:2;90:3;92:14; 100:22;102:17;123:22; 132:30;137:27;164:19, 26;184:14,15 putting (2) 88:17;158:17 0 qualified (1)

quantity (1) 104:24 quantity (1) 106:15 quick (1) 170:14 quicker (1) 135:9 quickly (4) 100:25;121:9; 135:13;167:29 quite (7) 113:14;114:9; 147:15,16;153:21; 174:26;186:1

R

radiation (2) 133:6,7 radically (1) 148:28 Randall (1) 84.4 random (11) 87:14;143:26,30; 144:1,1,3,5;150:28; 151:2;192:7,9 randomization (3) 150:24,27;151:1 randomized (3) 150:30;189:30; 191:25 randomly (4)

Min-U-Script®

Volume 2

Star Blends, et al.,				May 9, 2014
144.2.101.20.102.1	122.4 10 24.121.12.	127.12 17.162.20.	117.26.122.22.	representing (4)
144:2;191:30;192:1,	122:4,19,24;131:13;	127:13,17;163:29; 172:12;177:24,27	117:26;123:22;	82:5,11,16:84:13
Randy (3)	133:26,27,28;134:1,17,	referenced (2)	142:1;163:26;170:10 relation (1)	
	22,24;135:28,30,30;	174:16;177:19	140:22	reproductive (2) 172:24;173:7
176:16,23;179:23 range (3)	136:1;139:6;140:23; 141:9,10,13,25,27;	references (4)	relationship (3)	request (4)
137:18;178:24,24	142:26,28;148:17;	127:15;157:24;	188:7,9,10	85:16;150:11;
ranges (2)	149:28,29;150:9,11,30;	163:28;173:4	relative (2)	151:12;153:23
177:20;178:23	152:19;153:20,22,29;	referred (4)	89:27;194:13	requested (9)
rarely (1)	154:23;155:20;156:10,	116:17;127:19;	relatively (3)	141:19,26;149:16;
96:22 DASCAD (2)	13;158:7,8,17;160:1,4,	173:30;174:13	92:22;93:25;121:9	150:7,10,12;153:17,22;
RASGAP (3)	17;163:25;164:5,21,23,	referring (21)	release (2)	155:19
95:12;97:28;98:2	24;165:11;166:4;	120:19;126:21;	120:29;121:7	requesting (8)
rate (2)	168:8,13,29;169:7,8,	127:1,2;130:4,29,30;	released (1)	141:24,27;142:12;
186:28,30	11,27,30;170:24,24;	138:26;139:26;155:22;	142:27	149:18,28;150:9;
rather (8)	173:14,23;180:15,19;	160:5;164:6,11,17;	Relevancy (1)	153:20;155:20
86:11;101:9;103:11;	181:7,8,9;182:9,9,16;	168:10;172:30;176:26,	162:2	reread (1)
109:30;121:20;122:16;	183:23;184:17	27;180:11;187:9;	relevant (1)	159:18
128:2;185:29	recalling (1)	190:24	86:15	reschedule (1)
raw (2)	129:11	refers (6)	reliably (1)	175:8
148:8;166:7	receive (1)	129:24;143:24;	161:27	research (9)
reach (2)	115:26	151:25;159:11;161:2;	reluctance (1)	122:3;165:28;
157:30;161:5	received (1)	184:25	156:11	176:28;177:16;180:9,
reaction (1)	88:1	reflect (7)	remember (14)	28;181:18,24;189:18
104:22	recent (1)	93:23;130:10;	85:10,11,15;95:25;	researcher (1)
read (23)	121:30	150:23,26,29;160:26;	96:9;115:30;134:2;	185:13
114:25,27,29;	recently (1)	187:11	149:18;154:1;165:8,	researchers (2)
115:29,30;116:1,7,10;	121:25	reflected (3)	12;169:2;170:28;	122:20;172:3
135:10;136:19;154:28;	receptor (7)	142:12;146:18;	172:16	residual (1)
158:1;162:14;173:21,	94:29;105:28;106:1;	189:19	reminded (1)	190:4
22,24,26;174:1,1,2;	107:21;118:13;131:24;	reflection (1)	115:24	residuals (1)
176:12;179:22;193:4	132:3	116:3	render (1)	146:16
reading (4)	recess (3)	reflects (1)	176:19	Resisting (1)
117:8;172:16;193:1;	115:20;141:3;167:21	89:4	Repeated (3)	133:21
194:21	recipients (1)	refresh (1)	179:6,9,12	respect (15)
realize (2)	169:25	166:2	repeats (1)	85:3;102:15;105:12;
87:12;168:30	recognize (1)	regarding (5)	147:3	107:19;112:2,22;
really (10)	149:4	99:10;165:26;	replica (2)	114:17;117:30;132:13;
127:28;136:30;	recollection (1)	176:19;178:25;185:20	137:25;167:26	148:29;149:9;155:11,
144:7;146:16;150:30;	166:2	register (1)	replicas (2)	23;156:21;174:3
152:29;169:7;181:8;	record (6)	118:5	136:22;171:22	respects (1)
184:29;191:23	84:2;97:15;140:30;	regulatory (1)	replicate (1)	85:22
re-analysis (5)	166:13;192:13;194:17	98:24	155:12	respond (2)
142:13;149:28;	recorded (9)	rehashing (1)	replicates (1)	128:30;135:13
155:30;174:12;182:17	151:15;154:21;	182:12	190:4	responded (1)
rear (1)	166:7,16;181:19;	Reinemann (27)	replication (1)	85:20
170:5	182:8,9;193:5;194:15	85:14,22;135:23,25;	153:13	responding (1)
reason (7)	recording (1)	137:17;140:22;150:7;	report (12)	165:14
119:27;148:19;	182:10	153:16;155:18;156:8,	99:18;139:19;150:4;	response (17)
150:2;171:3;174:25;	records (2)	19,20;157:6,10;		107:24;108:2,5;
	100103(2)	19,20,137.0,10,	153:2;174:9;178:21;	107.24,100.2,3,
184:14;193:8				
184:14;193:8 reasonable (8)	141:12;166:7	160:16;163:25;165:5,	180:23;182:13,13;	109:12,27;110:16;
reasonable (8)	141:12;166:7 recruited (1)	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9,	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23;
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7;	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13;	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6)	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4;
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7; 171:20,28;174:13;	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9 red (2)	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13; 184:2,16	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6) 114:18;147:10;	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4; 187:19,21,22,24
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7; 171:20,28;174:13; 178:17;185:18,22	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9 red (2) 157:10,22	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13; 184:2,16 Reinemann's (4)	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6)	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4; 187:19,21,22,24 responses (8)
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7; 171:20,28;174:13; 178:17;185:18,22 reasonably (3)	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9 red (2) 157:10,22 RE-DIRECT (2)	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13; 184:2,16	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6) 114:18;147:10; 148:2;155:15;161:5; 163:29	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4; 187:19,21,22,24 responses (8) 111:20;119:18;
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7; 171:20,28;174:13; 178:17;185:18,22 reasonably (3) 88:11;151:6;185:26	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9 red (2) 157:10,22 RE-DIRECT (2) 176:4;182:25	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13; 184:2,16 Reinemann's (4) 137:5;156:28,30; 169:19	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6) 114:18;147:10; 148:2;155:15;161:5; 163:29 reporter (5)	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4; 187:19,21,22,24 responses (8) 111:20;119:18; 120:30;121:1,5;
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7; 171:20,28;174:13; 178:17;185:18,22 reasonably (3) 88:11;151:6;185:26 reasons (1)	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9 red (2) 157:10,22 RE-DIRECT (2)	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13; 184:2,16 Reinemann's (4) 137:5;156:28,30; 169:19 relate (4)	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6) 114:18;147:10; 148:2;155:15;161:5; 163:29 reporter (5) 83:26;114:30;	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4; 187:19,21,22,24 responses (8) 111:20;119:18; 120:30;121:1,5; 136:18;139:27;189:1
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7; 171:20,28;174:13; 178:17;185:18,22 reasonably (3) 88:11;151:6;185:26 reasons (1) 148:18	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9 red (2) 157:10,22 RE-DIRECT (2) 176:4;182:25 redrafted (1) 160:30	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13; 184:2,16 Reinemann's (4) 137:5;156:28,30; 169:19	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6) 114:18;147:10; 148:2;155:15;161:5; 163:29 reporter (5) 83:26;114:30; 124:13;154:26;179:8	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4; 187:19,21,22,24 responses (8) 111:20;119:18; 120:30;121:1,5; 136:18;139:27;189:1 responsible (1)
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7; 171:20,28;174:13; 178:17;185:18,22 reasonably (3) 88:11;151:6;185:26 reasons (1) 148:18 recall (91)	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9 red (2) 157:10,22 RE-DIRECT (2) 176:4;182:25 redrafted (1) 160:30 reduce (2)	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13; 184:2,16 Reinemann's (4) 137:5;156:28,30; 169:19 relate (4) 125:11;126:5;137:6, 9	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6) 114:18;147:10; 148:2;155:15;161:5; 163:29 reporter (5) 83:26;114:30; 124:13;154:26;179:8 reports (3)	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4; 187:19,21,22,24 responses (8) 111:20;119:18; 120:30;121:1,5; 136:18;139:27;189:1 responsible (1) 167:3
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7; 171:20,28;174:13; 178:17;185:18,22 reasonably (3) 88:11;151:6;185:26 reasons (1) 148:18 recall (91) 86:5;87:6,9,16,22,	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9 red (2) 157:10,22 RE-DIRECT (2) 176:4;182:25 redrafted (1) 160:30 reduce (2) 114:11;144:7	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13; 184:2,16 Reinemann's (4) 137:5;156:28,30; 169:19 relate (4) 125:11;126:5;137:6, 9 related (7)	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6) 114:18;147:10; 148:2;155:15;161:5; 163:29 reporter (5) 83:26;114:30; 124:13;154:26;179:8 reports (3) 154:25;184:11;187:7	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4; 187:19,21,22,24 responses (8) 111:20;119:18; 120:30;121:1,5; 136:18;139:27;189:1 responsible (1)
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7; 171:20,28;174:13; 178:17;185:18,22 reasonably (3) 88:11;151:6;185:26 reasons (1) 148:18 recall (91) 86:5;87:6,9,16,22, 28;88:13,17;110:26,27,	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9 red (2) 157:10,22 RE-DIRECT (2) 176:4;182:25 redrafted (1) 160:30 reduce (2) 114:11;144:7 refer (3)	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13; 184:2,16 Reinemann's (4) 137:5;156:28,30; 169:19 relate (4) 125:11;126:5;137:6, 9 related (7) 111:24;113:7;122:7,	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6) 114:18;147:10; 148:2;155:15;161:5; 163:29 reporter (5) 83:26;114:30; 124:13;154:26;179:8 reports (3) 154:25;184:11;187:7 represent (5)	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4; 187:19,21,22,24 responses (8) 111:20;119:18; 120:30;121:1,5; 136:18;139:27;189:1 responsible (1) 167:3 rest (1) 98:7
reasonable (8) 113:11;135:7; 171:20,28;174:13; 178:17;185:18,22 reasonably (3) 88:11;151:6;185:26 reasons (1) 148:18 recall (91) 86:5;87:6,9,16,22,	141:12;166:7 recruited (1) 110:9 red (2) 157:10,22 RE-DIRECT (2) 176:4;182:25 redrafted (1) 160:30 reduce (2) 114:11;144:7	160:16;163:25;165:5, 30;166:12,14;167:2,9, 12;169:24;183:13; 184:2,16 Reinemann's (4) 137:5;156:28,30; 169:19 relate (4) 125:11;126:5;137:6, 9 related (7)	180:23;182:13,13; 184:13;185:15,16 reported (6) 114:18;147:10; 148:2;155:15;161:5; 163:29 reporter (5) 83:26;114:30; 124:13;154:26;179:8 reports (3) 154:25;184:11;187:7	109:12,27;110:16; 111:12,18;135:8,23; 158:21;165:30;185:4; 187:19,21,22,24 responses (8) 111:20;119:18; 120:30;121:1,5; 136:18;139:27;189:1 responsible (1) 167:3 rest (1)

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

Star Blends, et al.,	Γ	Γ	Γ	May 9, 2014
result (4)	row (5)	185:29	selected (5)	103:29;135:29;136:11;
92:16;109:11;	89:30;145:10,11;	SC (1)	85:21;143:30;144:1;	141:18;142:6;166:15;
151:11;191:16	146:22;148:13	82:3	191:30;192:1	168:16
	rows (3)	scan (1)	seminar (3)	
resulting (1) 156:2	87:9,16,25	92:28	134:1,3;163:26	sheets (2) 156:29;159:6
results (22)	rubbed (1)	92.28 school (1)	send (1)	SHEFFIELD (19)
112:2;142:25;	170:6	159:18	158:28	81:24;83:16;84:17,
143:11,12,14,19;147:9,	rubbing (1)	science (4)	sense (4)	26;91:26;113:2;
20,25;148:30;154:11,	170:6	133:25;164:1;	109:23;153:2;164:3;	115:22;127:22;129:22;
17;155:3;157:27;	rudimentary (1)	179:24;180:7	188:2	140:26;141:5,20;
160:29;164:25,29;	112:13	scientific (3)	sent (4)	160:18;167:23;175:27;
177:17;181:7,8;	run (13)	185:18,23,30	115:24;135:26;	176:8;182:29;193:3;
189:22;190:19	98:26;110:22;	scientific- (1)	139:20;150:5	194:5
retired (2)	136:30;138:27;139:11,	93:19	sentence (1)	shop (1)
159:16;173:29	16;140:8;144:27;	scientists (1)	157:28	86:29
review (7)	152:16,19;153:14;	175:22	sequence (4)	short (4)
133:13;164:20,22;	154:7;172:7	Scott (3)	97:19;186:25;188:3,	115:16;154:12;
182:3;188:17,21,24	running (3)	82:2;83:28;84:10	4	163:22;167:13
reviewed (2)	159:27;174:26;177:4	screwed (1)	sequential (2)	shorter (1)
120:13;121:25	runs (2)	127:12	137:5;189:25	167:18
reviewing (2)	166:13;178:21	scribble (1)	sequentially (1)	shorthand (2)
120:16;138:12		152:5	142:21	91:22,28
RhoGDI (3)	S	SEAL (1)	series (5)	show (5)
95:12;98:5;128:12		194:24	113:28;128:14;	128:6;134:27;
right (53)	Saint (1)	search (1)	132:6;135:22;140:25	148:22;171:7;172:20
85:29;86:6;87:23;	82:4	122:26	serum (22)	showed (2)
88:9;89:9;91:12;92:4;	same (86)	second (21)	119:11,14;136:13;	105:4;180:21
94:12,16;96:29;97:20,	95:10;96:18;97:13,	85:4;102:19,21;	137:20;138:15,17,20;	shown (4)
21;98:7,30;99:5,27;	15,18;100:26,30;101:4,	150:8;156:21;157:27;	142:7;147:18;148:13,	95:18;129:18;
101:13;103:5;105:17;	15,29;102:2,2,2,26;	160:15,19;164:25;	19,29;149:23;162:21;	136:13;143:20
106:8,16;111:4;114:1,	105:12,17,18,27;107:5,	170:1;174:15,17;	185:12;186:26,27;	shows (6)
9,15,26;115:5,13;	10,19,26,30;108:12,13;	182:30;183:30;184:28,	190:21,26,27;191:10,	90:18,23;138:20;
116:26;117:21;118:6,	112:16,24,28;118:3,15,	29;186:16;188:11;	14	146:9;154:30;190:28
15;119:16;121:6;	17,19,21,29;120:20,21;	189:17;190:15;191:21	served (2)	sic (1)
122:7,19;123:13,18;	123:22,25,27,29;	secreted (5)	158:22;177:13	116:24
126:3,3;127:29;	124:10,22,25,27,29;	109:1,6;129:29;	serves (1)	side (2)
130:24;133:11,11;	125:1;126:11,30;	162:28;186:28	121:8 Samiaa (2)	107:5,24
139:4;142:11;155:29;	128:12;129:16,26,26;	secretion (1)	Services (3)	signal (2)
156:30;164:10;172:9;	130:29,30;131:6,18,27,	162:28 secretions (1)	81:12;82:22;83:23	96:13;133:3
188:28;190:14;191:18 righthand (3)	29;132:1,3,8,21; 138:16,20;140:4;	109:20	set (4) 100:27;147:6;	signaling (1) 125:8
108:7;136:14;137:17	143:7;146:3,27,29;	secretory (2)	149:13;160:20	signals (1)
RK (1)	148:16;157:20,23,26;	109:5;161:9	setup (1)	133:16
168:4	161:8;164:13;173:2,	section (5)	167:2	SIGNATURE (1)
RNA (23)	18;189:8,11,12,13,17,	106:29;160:29;	seven (1)	193:28
85:6;96:12;112:3;	25;191:3,6;193:6	166:17,20;169:18	169:12	signifi- (1)
156:22;178:11;185:1,	sample (4)	seeing (15)	seven-nine-five-eight (1)	114:20
27;186:16,21,23;187:2,	88:25;89:5;136:19;	87:6;101:24;105:22;	144:24	significance (17)
7,13,15,17,18,27,29;	143:6	121:16;135:28,30,30;	several (7)	90:3;111:13;114:12;
188:1,3,5,8,27	samples (6)	136:1;141:14;149:1;	95:11;99:2;103:30;	145:12,14;158:1;
Roger (4)	167:4,4;174:14,18,	166:5;169:27,30;	149:26;169:12;186:18;	161:6,6;184:20,21,23,
168:8,11;169:23;	24;181:28	175:25;182:22	188:5	25,27,30;185:8,9,20
170:30	SAS (7)	seem (6)	shall (4)	significant (14)
role (2)	137:6,22;142:27;	87:11;104:5;168:13;	102:15;115:16;	111:6,12,22;115:11;
109:16;127:7	143:19;145:8;146:25;	169:6,28;174:13	150:24;167:17	117:14;123:16;163:3;
roles (4)	149:24	seemed (2)	shape (1)	165:25;179:27;180:4;
102:4;127:4,7;129:9	S-A-S (1)	169:10;172:3	90:19	182:15;190:30;191:11,
Roman (11)	137:6	seems (8)	share (2)	15
94:8,13;106:9,10,11,	saw (3)	88:3;104:6;115:13;	168:16;175:1	significantly (1)
12,14,24,25;130:21;	100:4;164:22;185:14	166:18;169:4,12;	shared (1)	161:4
132:11	saying (8)	170:21;175:24	157:6	SIGNING (2)
round (2)	87:21,21,29;93:27;	sees (1)	sheet (12)	193:1;194:21
85:5;110:1	100:6;123:13;175:19;	128:4	87:1,5,15;98:7,15;	similar (13)

98:23:101:9:108:22; 117:3:127:4:145:15: son 146:28,28;150:30; 151:6,9;155:4;157:21 son similarly (1) 94:29 simple (5) 89:20:114:10:138:3: son 142:22;152:16 simplistic (3) son 114:19;117:12; 123:12 **SO**0 simply (7) 93:27;110:15;135:9; sop 137:28,28;172:1; 184:30 sor singular (1) 188:23 sit (3) 104:23;168:29; 173:22 site (1) sor 127:16 sitting (1) 163:20 situation (2) 94:25;170:3 situations (1) sor 107:13 six(3)sor 128:14:132:7.13 size (1) sou 136:19 skills (1) Soi 183:20 skip(2)sou 101:25:102:13 Sou skipped (1) 97:23 slightly (5) Spa 90:21;97:18;108:22; 157:30:161:3 spa small (7) 111:13;116:20; spe 154:13;163:11;172:7; 185:16;188:14 spe smaller (5) 90:2,24;117:9; spe 119:18;133:4 software (3) 88:3,5:90:14 solve (1) 173:12 some- (3) 131:9;138:4;192:11 somebody (5) 112:5;142:8;157:2,3; 189:5 someone (7) spe 142:10:157:11,15; 167:9;169:2;180:29; 188:17 spe someone's (1)

142:6	specifics (2
ometime (2)	110:22;1
142:27;189:12	spectrum
ometimes (9)	86:15
103:26;104:7;108:6;	speculate
109:5;129:30;130:1;	166:22
138:12;175:23;177:24	Speculatio
omewhat (1) 161:13	121:26;1 166:23
omewhere (3)	spell (5)
110:9,17,19	88:7;103
oon (1)	123:1;12
188:16	spelled (2)
ophisticated (1)	103:19;1
174:29	speller (1)
orry (15)	103:16
85:15;94:10;96:14; 105:26;107:7;108:25;	spend (2) 170:26;1
118:23,23,28;120:7;	split (2)
122:4;144:25;154:26;	151:25;1
167:29;179:21	spoke (2)
ort (13)	146:4;14
85:12;105:27;	spot (1)
106:15;113:5,16;	170:5
119:4;125:14;127:11;	spread (1)
133:2;134:6;149:21; 170:20;182:6	105:30 spread- (3
orted (1)	86:30;87
87:13	spreadshe
orts (2)	84:30;86
132:16;188:15	10,24;88
ound (2)	95:24,26
135:7;164:10	105:16;1
ounds (1) 105:26	111:25,2 115:22;1
ource (1)	117:5;12
144:13	129:18,2
outh (3)	159:13
81:28;82:3;91:6	spring (1)
parta (1)	163:28
81:9	square (4)
bawn (1) 135:11	145:23;1
beaking (3)	151:28 squares (6
112:4;128:17;191:18	144:14;1
pecies (3)	25;146:1
86:13;162:30;163:1	stack (1)
pecific (36)	135:4
91:15;92:5;99:11,23,	stall (1)
29;100:2,22,29;102:10, 29;104:20;105:24,25;	170:7 stalls (1)
106:6;107:15;108:2;	167:2
110:30;120:10;125:9;	standard (
126:7;127:6;129:14;	88:10,19
130:10,11;131:10,11;	128:30;1
132:15;133:12;134:23;	22;132:2
150:11;153:23;166:5;	150:20;1
177:27;179:5;180:5,22	Stands (9)
becifically (4) 113:18;118:8;	94:8,27; 125:6,24
126:15;182:10	144:14;1
pecificity (2)	Star (2)
86:7;96:17	81:8;83:

2) 120:14 (1) (1)on (3) 122:29; 3:14,15; 24:12 124:24 177:4 152:3 48:4 7:4,14 et (28) 6:25,26;87:6, 8:17:94:15; 6:101:20: 108:7;110:22; 28,29;114:18; 116:15.21; 20:1;123:19; 21:130:21; 146:20,21; ົງ 145:7,8,23, 15 (12)9:90:11; 130:24;131:18, 21:142:16; 178:12;179:4 ;98:23,24; 4:143:17: 145:5 18

Volume 2

start (14) 94:4:98:22:127:24: 132:6:135:21:148:16. 20.26:166:12:171:9: 173:4:179:3:181:24: 192:3 started (4) 132:24;152:28; 190:11;191:23 starting (3) 97:8;149:16;173:5 **STATE (17)** 81:1,15,27;83:18; 84:6;85:18,24;86:3; 91:7;134:20;135:26; 141:7;168:11;175:13; 182:1;194:1,8 stated (1) 93:25 statement (9) 129:2;132:22; 154:29;162:18;179:28; 180:15,16,18,19 States (1) 83:16 stating (1) 131:6 statistic-(1) 115:10 statistical (25) 88:20;89:4;111:22, 24.28:112:5.6:134:16. 18:138:10:140:13: 142:27;144:15;151:12; 153:11;154:20;155:4; 164:29;174:3,6; 182:29;184:21;189:23, 28;190:2 statistically (11) 111:6;117:14; 123:15;171:21;179:27; 180:4;182:15;190:30; 191:10.15.18 statistician (4) 113:26;140:15; 153:14;183:2 statisticians (1) 113:30 statistics (15) 88:10;90:11;113:5,7; 134:14;142:21;143:25; 146:10:150:8.19: 153:13;156:3;159:8, 15,16 STATS (1) 128:14 status (1) 167:11 stay (2) 158:29:168:22 Stenotype (1) 194:15 step (4)

186:19:187:19.20; 188:29 steps (3) 88:3:186:18:187:1 **Steve (11)** 138:14,27;139:13; 140:2,21;149:29; 150:6:151:1:153:15; 155:18,30 Steven (3) 134:13;135:24;150:5 Stevens (1) 176:15 stick (1) 97:8 still (11) 109:22;115:10; 117:14,19;123:14,15; 133:4;139:11;142:30; 158:30;163:4 stimulate (1) 129:30 stimulated (2) 102:8,11 stomping (1) 181:20 stopped (1) 190:12 storm (4) 120:19,20,23,27 straight (2) 88:28:144:28 Strav (2) 163:26:165:6 streak (1) 163:16 Street (1) 81:28 stress (3) 107:13,14;190:6 struck (1) 161:6 structures (1) 163:11 struggling (1) 168:26 student (1) 167:10 Student's (2) 88:24,26 studied (7) 104:9.26:113:9: 114:7;121:17;133:28; 173:14 studies (5) 95:18;105:2;121:13; 129:8;162:8 study (66) 85:4,7,13,22;86:8; 92:9.22;95:20;104:30; 105:2;109:18;110:1; 112:6:113:7:119:18: 121:16;134:14,19,20;

Star Blends, et al.,				May 9, 2014
138:11,30;140:22;	123:8,23;124:6;125:3,	91:15;92:5;99:11,23,	174:27;189:2	82:19;83:29
141:6,9;148:21;			TEK (2)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	19;126:26;129:1;	29;100:2,20,29;		theses (1) 146:20
150:15;154:8,13;	149:9;150:8	101:28;102:3,10,22,29;	95:18;128:27	
155:1,23;160:15,15,19;	sums (3)	104:8,9;105:22,25;	temperature (5)	thinking (2)
164:25,30;171:9;	144:14;145:7,8	107:15;108:5;125:10;	151:16,16,17;	131:1;153:25
172:15,16;173:6;	supplied (2)	130:10,13,16;131:10,	166:16;189:19	third (13)
174:4,5,15,16;180:20;	157:9;158:20	11,15;132:15;142:27;	temperatures (1)	98:7;120:3;145:6;
182:11,30;183:30;	support (1)	163:12;177:22;178:26	166:6	150:8;151:19;152:11,
184:8,12,28,28,29;	170:7	systems (1)	template (2)	14,14,15,15;157:25,28;
185:2,2,5,15,19,19,23,	suppressant (1)	163:17	186:22,24	167:27
24;186:16,17;188:15,	154:3	system's (1)	ten (12)	Thornton (62)
26;191:21,29	suppressed (1)	131:13	86:4;87:29;89:10,10;	82:8;83:5,30,30;
sub-acute (1)	154:29		105:10;110:24;113:21,	88:30;89:2;91:23;
122:15	Sure (56)	Т	22,25,30;114:1;167:16	93:10,11;94:11;95:1;
subject (4)	84:3,9;86:6;87:26;		tend (4)	99:15,24,27;101:8;
105:7;120:15;	88:1;89:20;90:22;95:8,	T/C (1)	128:20;130:7,9;	106:11,17,24;107:1;
140:20;165:10	23,27;96:14;97:21,30;	89:25	131:9	113:2,29;116:4,25;
submitted (5)	100:6;107:17,23;	table (43)	tendency (1)	118:27;119:17;120:2,
134:19;161:1;	111:8;114:25;115:18;	90:15;136:11,17,17,	157:29	4,12;121:26;122:29;
163:30;164:27;181:30	116:1;118:6;124:17,	24,27;137:9;138:19,	term (6)	124:16;126:14,19,24;
subpoena (4)	18;125:4;126:18,28;	26;139:28,30;143:23;	120:11;146:16,21,	127:11;130:27;132:28;
135:24;158:21;	127:18;128:23,24;	144:10;145:20,27;	25;178:6;184:23	143:2;144:11,22;
165:14;166:1	130:22,28,30;131:6;	146:4,9,15;148:11,13,	terms (8)	146:6;158:12;159:22;
subpoenaed (1)	134:3;135:17;139:3,	22;150:21;151:19,28;	93:20;125:11;	161:25;162:2,4;
86:27	24;144:28;145:1,5;	152:10;154:30;155:2,	142:24;187:30;188:2,	163:22;166:9,21,23;
subscript (1)	149:19,24;150:10;	3,5,10;158:10,19;	15,27;190:12	167:19;168:6,18;
116:20	151:27;152:2,8;	160:5,5,7,8,12;171:6;	terrible (1)	169:14,16;174:7,21;
subsequently (1)	154:19;158:13;161:11;	177:19,25;178:17;	103:15	175:6,15,30;180:12;
158:25	165:18;167:15;168:9;	179:5;183:12	test (17)	182:27
subset (1)	170:1;174:11;183:18,	tables (5)	88:20,22;138:3;	though (6)
123:4	24	90:7,8;134:30;	140:13;144:15;146:19;	97:22;100:21;
substance (1)	surface (1)	146:18;158:4	148:3;153:5,6;154:7;	109:22;121:11;134:30;
102:18	170:5	tabulated (1)	176:26;177:11,17;	170:30
substances (2)	surprised (3)	143:12	178:21;190:9,12,15	thought (10)
	92:17;104:3,12		tested (1)	88:30;92:16;104:27;
177:21;178:5 substantial (1)		tail (1) 174:19	149:11	118:14;119:27;122:12;
	surprising (2)			
96:2	101:24;147:13	tailed (3)	testified (3)	171:4;186:9;188:16;
subtle (1)	surrounding (1)	148:3;152:17;160:26	84:20;176:25;177:3	191:29
111:19	113:5	talk (6)	testify (2)	three (7)
sub-unit (1)	suspect (1)	89:15;134:16,28;	179:24;194:12	91:4;138:24;154:14;
98:25	128:19	175:6;176:1;189:3	testifying (3)	171:22;174:20;189:24;
sub-units (1)	suspicion (1)	talked (8)	159:23;165:6;194:11	190:4
127:25	87:11	84:30;91:27;99:19;	testimony (6)	throughout (2)
successful (2)	SV (1)	113:3;174:14;184:19,	88:12;91:3;176:18;	100:3;116:21
150:24,26	87:3	19;190:9	194:14,16,17	Tia (1)
suggest (4)	swear (1)	talking (5)	testing (2)	131:6
110:9;129:8;137:14;	83:26	136:21;172:5;	146:26;181:1	Tial (1)
173:9	Swedish (2)	180:18;182:5;186:15	tests (5)	130:28
suggested (3)	172:15,25	talks (3)	134:16;143:23;	Tie (1)
154:2;157:15;183:13	sworn (2)	87:3;152:7;169:20	177:6,7;183:12	130:23
suggestion (1)	84:19;194:12	Tape (2)	TGFb1 (2)	Tie1 (1)
154:2	sylvania (1)	83:15;160:3	129:16;130:12	130:21
suggestive (1)	163:28	teaching (1)	TGFB2 (1)	Tim (2)
185:28	symptoms (3)	122:1	129:26	83:30;175:29
summarize (3)	120:9;162:9;185:14	teat (1)	TGFBP (1)	time-frame (2)
91:9;96:27;110:12	S-y-n-t-h (1)	163:15	129:18	134:24;164:10
summarized (3)	125:16	technician (1)	TGFTransforming (1)	timely (2)
107:20;111:25;113:7	Synthase (5)	83:23	130:14	91:25;99:17
summarizes (1)	94:5;125:17,24,25,	technique (3)	thereafter (1)	times (20)
110:22	26	189:23,28;190:2	194:15	110:24,30;114:18;
summary (16)	synthases (1)	technology (1)	thereof (1)	115:3,6;117:6,7,10,15;
112:17,18;116:16,	127:5	86:11	194:9	118:8;123:8,14;126:8;
23;117:26,30;119:6;	system (31)	tedious (2)	Theresa (2)	160:22,23,23,24,25;
20,117.20,00,117.0,				100.22,23,23,21,23,

175:19:176:22 Timothy (1) 82:8 **TIMP3 (1)** 131:18 tion (2)136:1;173:29 tissue (8) 96:7;109:2;121:2; 122:11;123:3,5; 162:22,23 tissues (7) 104:6,7,8,27;109:12; 162:27;163:5 title (1) 143:16 titled (1) 172:21 TMFAlpha (1) 122:9 **TMFI** (1) 122:15 TNFalpha (3) 119:25;123:5;131:21 TNFRec (1) 131:24 Today (10) 83:13;91:3;104:23; 116:2;147:7;165:14; 168:30;175:11;176:19; 181:14 together (8) 98:26;103:28,30; 113:29:128:18:136:22: 165:15;174:22 told (7) 92:8,21:110:12; 115:15:138:9.29; 174:21 took (3) 153:9;175:15;194:4 tools (1) 86:9 top (25) 96:10;116:8;122:22, 24;128:27;129:11; 136:17;143:22;144:11, 13;145:26;146:6,8; 147:30;148:1;152:7, 14,15;168:25;172:14; 177:28,30;178:4,8; 189:30 total (5) 108:29;135:17; 189:7,9,14 toward (2) 168:14,21 **TPA** (1) 131:29 tract (3) 109:2,15;163:13 traditionally (1) 104:26

trained (1) 183:2 trainers (1) 172:18 Trans (2) 94:15;129:27 trans-(1) 130:4 transcribed (1) 194:16 transcript (9) 101:5;115:25,29; 116:11;133:14,15; 176:13;193:4,9 transcription (1) 186:20 transforming (1) 129:24 transient (1) 100:24 translation (1) 186:24 transported (1) 163:12 Transporter (6) 94:9,16,21,22; 106:23,28 TransV (1) 94:8 treated (7) 89:19,24;152:11; 171:2;179:26;180:3; 182:14 treating (1) 170:29 treatment (68) 87:13:88:23:89:5.10: 90:2,24,25;93:16,21, 22,24;109:8;110:29; 119:12:136:25:139:7: 140:5.9.10:143:28: 144:2,16,17,18;145:4, 4,24,27,28,29;146:2,5, 8,17,21,26;148:11,15, 16,18,20,25,27;149:6, 30;151:3,23,23;153:5; 154:3,15,16;155:5; 156:4,4;170:22,25; 171:16,21;189:8,15; 190:23;191:8,9,13,21, 26:192:10 treatments (8) 87:13;136:25; 137:23;143:29;144:9; 148:3;189:10;192:2 **TREMPEALEAU (2)** 81:1;83:19 trial (1) 168:22 tried (1) 188:16 trouble (3) 127:20:168:25;

170:19 true (14) 92:21;97:15;105:12, 15;107:26;116:20; 117:19;142:19;161:28; 162:6;171:26;175:5; 193:6;194:16 trunk (1) 163:20 truth (2) 194:12,13 try (9) 86:14;93:11,12,19; 135:2,15,16,19;176:12 trying (7) 93:6;133:6;152:29; 154:29;187:18;188:1; 190:19 t-test (18) 88:22,24,25,26;89:6, 8,11,11;90:1;110:23; 112:19:140:6.8; 152:17;155:9,10,10; 160:20 tthornton@briggscom (1) 82:10 tube (1) 170:3 tumor (2) 131:21,24 turn (3) 157:25;167:27,29 turns (3) 95:17;104:4;162:28 twitching (1) 181:21 two (28) 88:22,25;89:5;93:12; 99:30:105:8:110:4.5: 122:5;127:15;131:4; 133:14,14;142:14; 144:9;145:24;148:3; 149:5;150:29;151:5; 152:17;154:5;160:26; 187:28;191:6,17,22; 192:12 two-fold (3) 121:15;161:13,22 type (12) 121:13;129:10; 144:14,14;145:8; 146:20:151:12:157:22: 174:12;179:12;180:29, 30 typed (5) 94:17;106:22,29; 151:27;157:10 types (4) 144:4;150:19;151:7; 184:11 typewritten (6) 136:4.13:138:15: 151:20;152:10;169:13

Volume 2

typical (2) 111:9:151:9 typically (1) 119:19 typographical (1) 103:11 U unclear (1) 126:25 under (11) 84:20;114:21; 146:29;147:28,29; 148:2,30;155:26; 157:27;160:28;161:13 under-goes (1) 186:23 Understood (7) 85:10,27;96:30; 101:11,16;113:28; 172:6 unexpected (1) 96:1 unfortunately (2) 108:24;163:19 unit (1) 110:8 universal (1) 107:16 University (12) 86:27,29;91:7; 134:11:156:26:158:22 29,30;159:9,17;166:1, 11 University's (2) 158:21:175:2 unless (1) 165:1 unlike (1) 102:10 unlikely (2) 95:5,7 unsure (5) 94:7,28,30;102:14, 28 unusual (2) 171:22,29 up (31) 90:15;91:11;95:8,23; 100:6,24;108:29; 114:15:119:12:120:24 124:13;127:12;128:6; 129:12;135:4,6,12; 136:17;152:7;153:25, 26;154:2,12;159:26; 165:10;168:25,26,26; 170:20;183:12;189:16 upon (6) 99:16:116:3:141:18: 142:12;150:23;191:5 urge (1) 133:21

	Urokinase (1) 132:1
	use (18)
	86:21;93:15;113:21;
	115:17;139:7;146:16, 25;147:7;162:10;
	171:5;172:17,17,23;
	173:8,11,16;174:29;
	179:14
	used (12)
	86:20;88:11,20; 96:20;102:21;122:30;
	137:3,6;179:11,17;
	186:24;189:8
,	uses (2)
5	90:13;145:8 using (13)
	88:5;143:9;146:20;
	149:29;150:15;151:2;
	153:12,29;154:8;
	156:4;173:18;174:12;
	186:22 usual (1)
	181:10
	usually (9)
	111:6;116:19;
	122:15;127:12;134:13; 144:4;161:5;171:13;
	184:10
	utilities (1)
	165:6
	utilized (2) 139:20;173:15
, ,	utter (7)
,	162:22,25,26;163:6,
	7,16,16
	UW (2) 85:30;88:1
	05.50,00.1
	V
	vaccinating (1) 134:6
	vague (1)
	172:3
	valid (1)
	182:21 Valley (2)
	82:23;83:23
	value (36)
	89:29,30;90:4,5,9,
;	18;95:23;110:23; 111:13,14;112:19,29;
	114:12,20;117:9,13;
	118:3;123:7;136:13;
	138:17,20;144:16,19;
-	145:9,10;146:2,9,22;
5	147:9,28,29;148:2; 161:7;190:21,28;191:5
	values (25)
	88:14,19;111:9;
	117:4;139:7;145:30;
	147:12;151:24;152:20;

Star Blends, et al.,				May 9, 2014
155 15 159 5 159 20	92.21	00.02.06.01.102.01		146.2
155:15;158:5;159:30;	82:21	88:23;96:21;103:21;	worked (2)	146:3
160:8,14,19,21;161:5;	View (1)	109:19,20;111:29;	167:9;169:3	0.796 (1)
177:26;178:9,10,11,11,	81:5	124:1;145:12;146:17;	workers (1)	148:4
12,17;179:4	virtue (1)	147:28;151:18;169:14	141:7	0000821 (1)
VAN (1)	194:9	whereas (1)	working (4)	111:1
82:14	voicing (1)	189:1	165:28;167:3;	0003 (2)
variability (1)	101:14	WHEREUPON (1)	176:16;183:27	147:29;191:5
139:10	voltage (6)	83:9	works (1)	01 (2)
variable (17)	89:19;93:3,6,13;	whichever (1)	143:1	160:4;161:4
89:16;91:14,16,29;	163:27;165:6	174:18	worth (1)	04 (1)
99:10,11;103:3,6;	voltages (1)	Whitney (1)	188:12	161:8
112:10;136:12;137:19;	86:22	82:23	write (4)	05 (10)
143:16;149:21;151:14;	VOLUME (3)	whole (2)	142:10;152:9;157:2,	111:6,9;112:29;
		136:4;156:18		
153:3,12;190:18	81:23;83:14;186:29		$\frac{2}{2}$	114:13,21;115:3,6;
variables (23)	vouch (1)	who's (1)	WRITING (1)	155:15;159:30;191:1
91:10;92:9,14,18,19;	158:18	184:11	193:9	071 (1)
93:26,28;94:23;99:8;		whose (6)	written (6)	138:16
111:27;113:9,15;	W	112:4;136:5,10;	107:2;127:1;136:5;	
114:7,10,13;115:10;		152:1;159:3;183:13	142:7;152:3;168:1	1
132:6,13;145:16,24;	Wadena (1)	WI (1)	wrong (1)	
150:20;151:7;183:5	82:15	81:13	123:13	1 (32)
variance (9)	wait (1)	wide (4)	wrote (3)	81:28;83:15;94:27,
137:30;138:1;	179:21	102:19;105:30;	98:20;152:8;157:6	27,28;95:11;98:25;
140:17;144:7;145:20,	waste (1)	125:8,26		106:20;107:22;124:3;
27;146:11;147:3;	101:14	widely (2)	Χ	127:15;130:21,23;
152:20	watcher (1)	88:11;107:23		132:3;136:11,12,17,17;
variant (1)	168:7	wikipedia (3)	Xcel (1)	147:18,19;160:5,7,22;
190:3				
	watching (1)	127:12,15,17	81:12	161:12,22,29;162:10;
variation (1)	96:16	Wing (5)	N 7	172:13;179:25;180:3;
150:20	water (8)	81:19;82:16;84:5,14;	Y	181:1;182:13
variety (5)	166:6,16;167:24;	176:24		1.5 (1)
102:19;120:29;	181:4,10,20;182:4,6	WISCONSIN (11)	year (1)	161:22
125:8,26;130:15	wave (1)	81:1,4,6,9,29;82:4;	134:21	1.65 (1)
various (9)	133:21	83:18,21;85:24;134:4;	years (7)	119:8
95:4;127:24;128:8;	way (37)	194:6	85:15;86:4;87:29;	1.78 (1)
134:15,25;154:16;	86:16;89:26;93:25,	wisely (1)	90:17;105:10;121:29;	119:9
163:18;177:21;178:14	27;110:1;112:28;	177:5	122:11	1:03 (1)
varying (1)	114:4;116:4;117:16,	within (5)	yield (2)	141:3
132:17	18,19;119:25;120:3;	143:7,13;145:28;	151:8;153:10	10 (24)
vascular (3)	121:11;126:22;127:14;	146:17,24		90:28;110:30;
104:8,9;122:14	133:24;139:18;140:16;	without (5)	Ζ	114:18;115:3,6,7;
vein (1)	141:29,30;143:28;	87:25;116:1;127:16;		117:6,7,10,15;118:8;
174:19	147:12;152:9,25,27;	161:23;182:22	zero (6)	123:8,14;128:27;
veracity (1)	155:7;156:11;161:20;	withstand (1)	90:23;133:2;144:22,	131:19;158:6,6;
158:18		188:21		
	162:20;168:18;170:18;		22,23,24	159:30;160:22,23,24,
verified (1)	175:6;181:19;184:26;	witness (8)	zeros (3)	24,25;178:30
159:19	188:26;189:4	83:26;84:18;165:19;	111:1,3,4	10/6 (1)
verify (1)	ways (1)	174:8;194:11,14,17,24		141:20
170:14	107:2	wondering (1)	0	10:37 (1)
version (2)	Web (1)	181:17		115:20
157:18;158:14	127:16	word (6)	0.003211 (1)	10:54 (1)
versus (3)	week (2)	95:28;117:22;119:4;	112:20	115:20
83:18;84:5;176:24	153:5;174:20	122:7,30;133:18	0.05 (1)	100 (5)
veterinarian (1)	weeks (1)	words (10)	158:1	114:10,20,21;115:3,
91:6	149:17	91:5,16;118:11;	0.07 (1)	9
Veterinary (6)	welcome (1)	119:11;121:17;122:15,	144:19	1071 (1)
91:8;133:25,25;	140:25	27;123:5;154:5;175:21	0.071 (2)	82:23
134:4;159:18;172:22	well-randomized (1)	work (15)	136:13;138:20	11 (8)
via (1)	151:10	91:24;104:28;112:5;		96:6;120:4;148:10,
			0.08 (1)	
174:19	weren't (6)	156:15;157:4;159:5;	144:20	12;154:22,25;155:3,10
video (2)	164:28;177:8;184:6;	165:5;174:8;175:13;	0.10 (1)	11:59 (1)
83:15,22	189:8,24,25	176:19,21,23;179:11; 182:18,29	157:30	141:3
VIDEOOD A DITED (4)	TTROTIC (17)		ID 7058 (1)	116 (1)
VIDEOGRAPHER (1)	what's (12)	102.10,29	0.7958 (1)	110(1)

Star Dichus, et al.,		1	1	May 9, 2014
82:14	182 (1)	154.22 22 25.156.2.	82:29;167:23	55124 (2)
^{62.14} 117 (1)	83:5	154:22,23,25;156:2;	2.29,107.25 289 (1)	82:23;83:24
82:3	85:5 1990 (1)	180:12,13,23;181:19,	172:20	
		30;190:9		55402 (1)
11-CV-12-1670 (2)	133:26	251 (2)	29 (1)	82:10
81:16;84:6	1990s (2)	157:19;174:17	170:10	56482-0647 (1)
12 (13)	142:28;165:7	252 (2)	2	82:16
136:19,26,26;	1998 (1)	82:28;173:27	3	5-9-14 (1)
137:22,23;140:8,9;	173:7	254 (27)		193:5
148:3,3;152:11,12;	1999 (5)	82:29;84:29;86:25;	3 (8)	5th (7)
189:7,14	134:21;167:26;	89:15;91:9;94:12,19;	95:5;124:8;145:8;	111:1;114:19;
12-CV-74 (1)	169:15;179:24;180:7	96:29;97:8,21;98:8;	146:20;148:14,14,17;	117:10;123:9;158:6;
83:19		105:17;106:11,14,15;	178:30	160:22,25
12TH (1)	2	107:4,5;113:7;116:15;	3:24 (1)	
194:24		124:9;128:26;131:3;	192:15	6
13 (2)	2 (20)	158:5,13;160:20;	30201 (1)	
95:23;155:15	94:11;98:25;103:1,2;	178:6;183:12	81:3	6 (5)
138-18 (1)	115:6,7;124:7;130:23;	2600 (1)	30303 (1)	95:4;117:6,7;118:8;
82:27	138:19;139:28;144:14,	137:18	81:3	124:16
1394 (1)	14;147:19;151:19;	2656 (1)	36 (3)	612-977-8400 (1)
169:17	152:10;155:5;159:23;	137:19	147:26,27,27	82:10
14 (1)	167:26;172:14;178:30	27 (1)	37 (6)	647 (1)
176:18	2.55 (2)	170:10	147:26,27,30;148:1,	82:15
141-17 (1)	117:7;160:23	275 (21)	13;191:4	6th (4)
82:28	2.93 (2)	82:26;90:28;91:23,	3861 (3)	158:7;160:23,24,25
149-26 (1)	123:8;160:25	30;94:14,17;100:28;	168:1;169:20;170:10	10017,100123,21,25
82:29	2:15 (1)	105:18;106:12;116:16,	39 (1)	7
15 (3)	167:21	25,26;120:4;123:22;	149:1	
143:15,22;145:19	2:26 (1)	124:6,25;126:12;	117.1	7 (4)
15,000 (1)	167:21	128:27;129:19;131:19;	4	148:14,15,17,17
172:15	20 (2)	178:7	•	7932 (2)
150-6 (1)	90:29;113:25	276 (4)	4 (14)	190:21,28
82:26	2000 (2)	88:30;112:17;	94:21;106:15,17,19,	7958 (1)
153-15 (1)	149:27;153:18	116:23;159:3	21,23;107:1,2;115:4;	144:20
82:27	2000s (1)	277 (4)	117:15;120:1;123:14;	144.20
156-29 (1)	165:4	82:27;88:29;89:3;	128:26;189:10	8
82:28	2003 (2)	90:6	4.98 (2)	0
1595 (1)	163:28;164:8	278 (9)	118:8;160:24	8 (9)
166:12	2007 (2)	135:22;138:16,21,	40 (1)	98:24;135:17;
16 (7)	134:11;158:22	26;141:16,29;190:21,	149:1	139:28;140:25;153:17;
143:21,22,23;	2008 (3)	24,25	4013 (1)	
144:12,13;145:20;	86:28;134:11;158:23	279 (7)	151:30	189:9,11,13,14
146:30			403 (1)	8.21 (5)
	2009 (1) 134:5	82:28;141:17,18;		110:23,30;114:18;
1611 (1)		142:6,12;149:10;191:4	82:3	117:9;160:22
166:14 1663 (1)	2014 (4)	28 (2)	413 (1)	8.74 (2)
1663 (1) 167-28	81:28;83:13;194:5,	135:25;170:10	151:29	117:6;160:23
167:28	24	280 (2)	5	8121 (1)
1669 (1) 167:20	218-631-2505 (1) 82:15	149:16,18	3	111:2
167:30	82:15	281 (2)	5 (0)	821 (1)
167-23 (1)	22 (1)	82:29;149:26	5 (9)	111:3
82:29	170:10	282 (3)	94:8,9,16;115:3,6;	84 (1)
1674 (1)	23 (1)	82:26;150:6;171:6	117:14;123:14;145:4,4	83:3
169:17	170:10	283 (1)	503 (7)	84-29 (1)
17 (5)	24 (1)	151:11	159:6,7,7,7,8,10,14	82:29
145:20,22,26;146:7,	189:14	284 (2)	5066 (1)	88-29 (1)
8	2400 (1)	82:27;153:15	146:10	82:27
173-27 (1)	82:9	285 (1)	54232-0117 (1)	0
82:28	249 (2)	155:17	82:4	9
175 (1)	164:14,15	286 (5)	54630 (2)	
171:8	25 (1)	82:28;156:29;	81:4,6	9 (5)
176 (1)	169:15	172:11;174:17;176:28	54656 (1)	83:13;95:5;135:17;
83:4	250 (16)	287 (1)	81:9	138:19;140:25
18 (1)	82:27;138:18,19;	165:27	54702 (1)	9:22 (2)
89:12	139:20;148:2,22;	288 (2)	81:13	81:29;83:14
	L			l

Star Dienus, et al.,		
90-28 (1)		
82:26		
90s (1)		
165:4		
920-773-2811 (1)		
82:4		
952-997-6455 (1)		
952-997-0455 (1)		
82:24		
99 (2)		
135:25;141:20		
9th (2)		
81:27;194:5		